THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

VOL. CXXXV, No. 4 OCTOBER, 1956

CONTENTS

An Evaluation of Moral Rearmament
Ralph J. Bastian, S.J., and John A. Hardon, S.J. 217

An Aside to the Mariological Interpretation of Genesis 3:14 ..... *John J. O'Rourke* 227

Lea, Coulton and Anti-Catholicism. Part II
John E. Coogan, S.J. 231

Loneliness and the Eucharist ..... *John Carr, C.SS.R.* 244

Morality in Political Campaigning
Edward J. Carney, O.S.F.S. 252

Liturgical and Private Prayer ..... *John H. Miller, C.S.C.* 257

Christian Humanism and the Kingdom of Christ ..... *John Carroll Futrell, S.J.* 264

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., and Romaeus W. O'Brien, O. Carm.

Broadmindedness or Indifferentism? 267

The *Sanatio in radice* and Unborn Children 271

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1956, by the Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Preceding Page*)

The Primary End of Marriage and the Validity of Marriage 272
Gifts to a Religious for a Specific Purpose 274

ANALECTA

Review of Recent Roman Documents
Romaeus W. O'Brien, O.Carm. 275

BOOK REVIEWS

Logic, *by Kenneth F. Dougherty, S.A.* 278
Tales of the Long Bow, *by G. K. Chesterton* 279
The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Originality of Christ, *by Geoffrey Graystone, S.M.* 280
I Am a Daughter of the Church, *by P. Marie-Eugene, O.C.D.* 282
Our Children and the Mass, *by Alain Sauveboeuf* 284
Saint Joseph, *by Henri Rondet, S.J.* 286
The Christian Life, *by Albert Weiss, O.P.* 287

Unique Chalice

In this magnificent jewelled Chalice, inspired design and surpassing skill of the silversmith's art have combined to create a vessel of rare dignity and beauty. An unusual effect is the Rosary raised from the base by the art of chasing. Base and pillar are of sterling silver gold plated, with applied medallions and statuette of Our Lady of Providence in silver oxidize finish. Bowl is 14 karat solid gold.

Gorham solicits assignments of this nature — sketches of special designs submitted.

Gorham
PROVIDENCE 7, RHODE ISLAND
AMERICA'S LEADING SILVERSMITHS SINCE 1831

AN EVALUATION OF MORAL REARMAMENT

Catholics are not normally much interested in revivalist movements among Protestants, and are certainly not concerned whether such movements have the Church's approval. A Catholic, for example, may read with perfect detachment about the crowds of a hundred thousand who listen to Billy Graham's sermons. Graham is a Baptist, preaching to Protestants, and evidently doing them much good. But when a spiritual revivalism like Moral Rearmament is addressed to people of all faiths, and members of the Catholic Church, including lay leaders and theologians, co-operate in the movement—it is not only news but a matter for study and critical reflection.

The problem is more acute in Europe, since the international headquarters of MRA are in Switzerland, and the movement has found a wider response there than in the United States. But American Catholics cannot afford to ignore it. Its founder is an American, and for several years MRA has been holding its world congress at Mackinac Island, Michigan, with active centers throughout the United States.

DEVELOPMENT OF MORAL REARMAMENT

Frank N. D. Buchman, founder of MRA, was born in 1878 of Pennsylvania Dutch ancestry. He studied for the Lutheran ministry at Philadelphia, also travelling abroad to England and Germany. Assigned to a poor parish at his own request, he soon brought it to a flourishing condition by his zealous activity. In 1904 he turned to work with youth, and took up a position as chaplain in a youth center. But a disagreement arose between him and the administration over the use of funds for the institution, and Buchman left to travel in Europe. Here, in the English village of Keswick, as he attended a Sunday afternoon session of the village church where a woman evangelist preached about the cross and how Christ had taken on Himself the sins of the world, Buchman had a "spiritual experience." He suddenly saw that all his knowledge of Christianity was only theoretical. His duty was to put it into actual practice. Since personal sin was the cause of the world's evil, there was need for personal repentance. The very first step

of his conversion was to write the six members of the committee in Pennsylvania and ask their forgiveness for his part in the argument.

Returning to America, he carried out his intention of imparting to others his own grasp of the religious truth he had seen by converting the atheist son of the family with whom he was boarding. Through his connection with the YMCA, and then Harvard University as a lecturer in personal evangelism, Buchman began to form followers in the ivy league colleges of the East. Soon the practice of house parties, at which students and often prominent men and women gathered to seek the "change," became prevalent throughout the country. One of the principal techniques for this *metanoia* was a public confession of one's faults, a device that caused trouble, particularly on college campuses, where the confessions were largely sexual.

In the early twenties he transferred his activities to Oxford, where he established a systematic organization of co-workers and followers under the title of the "First Century Christian Fellowship." Ardent disciples were soon spreading the Buchman principles throughout the world. Quite accidentally the movement came to be known as the Oxford Group, and under this sobriquet it spread widely in Protestant countries, especially Australia, Holland, Scandinavia, and South Africa. Under pressure from opposition because of the house parties and the practice of public confession, Buchmanism entered into a second stage of development. As war clouds gathered over Europe, Dr. Buchman proposed the name Moral Rearmament to a group of his friends at a meeting in the Black Forest in Germany, and thereby shifted the emphasis from individual change to social salvation. On May 29, 1938, he said: "The crisis is fundamentally a moral one. The nations must re-arm morally. Moral recovery is essentially the forerunner of economic recovery."[1]

During the war the movement spread rapidly, especially in America. In July, 1939, for example, 30,000 gathered at the Hollywood Bowl to hear Buchman proclaim the principles and merits of MRA. In 1942 he organized a center on Mackinac Island which attracted large numbers of people from all over the world during the war years. Since then the major activities of MRA

[1] Buchman, Frank N. D., *Remaking the World* (London, 1955), p. 46.

have been concentrated in Caux, Switzerland, where the idle Palace Hotel was purchased as a central headquarters.

DOCTRINE OF MORAL REARMAMENT

The basic tenet of MRA is that the reformation of the world can only be achieved by creating a moral and spiritual force, by convincing all men of the necessity of *absolute honesty, absolute purity, absolute unselfishness,* and *absolute love.* As helps to the practice of these cardinal virtues and to the further development of their moral life, the members of MRA engage in the exercises of sharing, surrender, substitution, and guidance. It is the last practice in particular that is of interest in an evaluation of this group.

Many leaders, Buchman states, are convinced that the world needs a moral and spiritual awakening, and they put their case in striking phrases. But that is only words. The problem facing men is how to do it. To solve this difficulty Buchman turns to God:

> Now I find when we don't know how, God will show us if we are willing. When man listens, God speaks. When man obeys, God acts. The secret is God-control. We are not out to tell God. We are out to let God tell us. And He will tell us.
>
> The lesson the world most needs is the art of listening to God.[2]

Listening to God is the heart of MRA. As a program of spiritual reformation, it must be performed according to protocol. Everyone must set aside a "quiet time" of fifteen minutes a day to listen to the voice of God. Although "anyone can hear the words of the Lord," it is also necessary to obey certain rules:

> The first rule is that we listen honestly for everything that may come—and if we are wise we write it down. The second rule is that we test the thoughts that come, to see which are from God.
>
> One test is the Bible. It is steeped in the experience through the centuries of men who have dared, under Divine guidance, to live experimentally with God. There, culminating in the life of Jesus Christ, we find the highest moral and spiritual challenge—complete honesty, purity, unselfishness, and love.
>
> Another excellent test is, "What do others say who also listen to God?" This is an unwritten law of fellowship. It is also an acid test

[2] *Ibid.,* p. 35.

of one's commitment to God's plan. No one can be wholly God-controlled who works alone.[3]

Buchman is sure that he has this direct guidance from on high:

In a revolution I went through not long ago, God gave me direct orders to stay in a place which the authorities had said was the most dangerous of all. I stayed. Others, who fled in search of safety, nearly lost their lives. My friend and I were perfectly safe.[4]

The results of his listening are clear. He finds that God's thoughts become his thoughts. In fact, "direct messages come from the Mind of God to the mind of man—definite, direct, decisive. God speaks."[5]

This gift is not limited to himself. Everyone can, in fact, must, receive his instructions directly from God:

We accept as a commonplace a man's voice carried by radio to the uttermost parts of the earth. Why not the voice of the living God as an active, creative force in every home, every business, every parliament? Men listen to a king when he speaks to his people over the air. Why not to the King of Kings? He is alive, and constantly broadcasting.[6]

Thus divine guidance must become the normal experience of ordinary men and women. "Any man," says Buchman, "can pick up divine messages if he will put his receiving set in order. Definite, accurate, adequate information can come from the Mind of God to the minds of men."[7]

Receiving this communication from God to begin a life governed by absolute honesty, purity, unselfishness, and love is only the first step. It is the reform of self which must come before anything else can be accomplished. But the aim of MRA is more comprehensive. Buchman envisages the change not only of individuals, but, through them, of the entire human race:

Wherever I go people say one thing: "If only so-and-so would be changed!" You probably thought of the very person. Or you probably thought of five persons. Well, think of five persons changed. Think of nations changed. Is that the answer? The world is looking for an answer, and, by the Grace of God, there is an answer. But be clear on this

---

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 36.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 40.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 72.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 13.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

point, the answer is not in any man or any group of men. The answer rests in the living God. It rests in a God-controlled person. It rests in a God-controlled nation. It rests in God-controlled supernationalism.[8]

Individual change of hearts leading to the reformation of the world is the plan and purpose of MRA. Moral Rearmament, therefore, is not a new organization which prescribes allegiance to a system of truths or precepts, but avowedly is only a means of deepening the truths which every man must hold. It is neither a church nor a religious sect. There are no dogmas to profess; no rites to practice. MRA exists only to change the lives of men, to make zealous reformers out of sinners, who still remain members of their individual churches. "Catholic, Jew and Protestant, Hindu, Muslim, Buddhist and Confucianist—all find they can change, where needed, and travel along this good road together."[9]

ACHIEVEMENTS OF MORAL REARMAMENT

The force generated by the devoted and energetic followers of MRA is not to be underestimated. Undoubtedly the movement has been of considerable moral aid to many of its members as a rallying ground against the forces of secularism in the modern world. The lives of many who would never subscribe to a "church" morality have been touched and changed for the better by MRA, which brings Christian ethics into the worldly atmosphere of the twentieth century.

Since there are no formal rites of initiation and no membership rolls, we have no estimate of the number of followers of the movement. As put in a popular slogan, "You don't join anything, you don't pay anything, you just begin living the MRA standards." But judging by the thousands of participants at Buchmanite rallies, and the wide circulation of MRA books and pamphlets, this Protestant counterpart of the Christophers is a flourishing "organization." Among its advocates are listed political and social leaders in Europe and America. During the war years Harry S. Truman was an enthusiastic partisan of Dr. Buchman. Mr. Robert Schuman and Dr. Konrad Adenauer have participated in MRA meetings in Caux. MRA claims fabulous success among the workers. When war production in factories and mines had slackened, MRA leaders talked to the workers and infused new life into industry. Quarrels

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 25.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 166.

and labor troubles disappeared. Executive heads of twelve of America's national trade unions sent a message of gratitude to Dr. Buchman:

> Through the years the force you have trained has been strengthening union loyalty and leadership and uniting people above party, race, class, point of view and personal advantage. MRA is calling us and every nation to our true heritage under God.[10]

One observer sees MRA as the answer to labor's problems:

> 1. It changes the basic selfishness and greed in human nature (that sabotage even the best economic plans) and so ensures the creation of an entirely new type of Christian democracy.
>
> 2. It creates the unity of labour by answering the root causes of present-day division—drive for power, personal ambition, jealousy and materialism.
>
> 3. It sets a further goal for labour—to think and plan for the whole world, people of every class, every race, every nation and not just for ourselves or our own party.
>
> 4. It develops the moral qualities and character of youth that will enable them to take responsibility in the building of a new world.[11]

"It is impossible," according to Sir Arnold Lunn, "to deny that M.R.A. has some very real achievements to its credit in the industrial field, and the reiterated attacks on M.R.A. by Moscow are impressive evidence to its effectiveness in converting Communists. I met at Caux many former Communist leaders."[12]

To its credit, therefore, MRA has succeeded in uniting many people of diverse countries, religions, and social conditions. It has provided them with a plan of action intended to bring about a moral change in the members and, through them, in the rest of the world.

APPRAISAL OF MORAL REARMAMENT

However, the mere possession of laudable aims and even some achievement of moral reform would not justify active Catholic

[10] *Report on Moral Re-Armament,* ed. R. C. Mowat (London, 1955), p. 63.

[11] The speaker is James Haworth, President of the Transport Salaried Staffs Assoc., and a member of the National Executive of the Labour Party in England, *Report on Moral Re-Armament,* p. 64.

[12] "M.R.A. and Its Critics," *Tablet,* 203 (June 19, 1954), 591.

participation in the MRA movement. A more basic decision about MRA must be agreed upon. Is MRA a religious movement independent of the Catholic Church? If the answer is affirmative, then formal cooperation for a Catholic is out of the question. If the answer is negative, further examination must be made to determine how far a Catholic may cooperate in MRA activities. "Moral Re-Armament," says Karl Adam, "is not, as its name might imply, merely an ethical movement, but a religious, indeed in the deepest sense, a Christian movement. But it is no way a confession or a church community."[13] Adherents of MRA heartily approve this estimate, as seen from the publicity they have given to Adam's favorable judgment of Moral Rearmament, based on the *de jure* tenets of the organization. But an examination of some basic definitions suggests that MRA is a religious organization in its *de facto* operation.

Religion, in a wide sense, is a system of truths and the obligations arising therefrom which constitute a man's relationship to God. This system of truths is made known to us naturally by the law of creation, manifested to every man. In addition, since man has been raised to a supernatural state, he has received divine revelation to aid him in attaining this higher goal. The truths of Christian revelation were transmitted to the human race through the prophets and Jesus Christ and marked by most clear testimonies that the message came from heaven and contained the word of God.

It is a matter of faith that Christian revelation was closed with the death of the last Apostle. Any other revelation since then, unless confirmed by divine approval, is to be considered spurious and in opposition to Catholic Christianity.

Since MRA clearly professes to have a revelation, it is, therefore, a religion. Every page of Buchman's writings shows that the members are expected to be in daily contact with God in the quiet times. Even though Buchman "issued no orders," yet "every man has the privilege of being personally guided by God."[14] An Englishman active in MRA writes:

> Countless lives have been lit on their way by occasional flashes of divine illumination. Many have followed a star. But for Frank Buchman

---

[13] "Moral Re-Armament and Christianity in the West," from *Vaterland,* Aug. 12, 1952, quoted in *Remaking the World,* p. 256.

[14] *Remaking the World,* p. xiii.

it would be more truthful to say that the detailed, constant, accurate leading of God is as natural and powerful as daylight. It comes to him fresh every morning, like the sunrise—as welcome and as inevitable. . . . No man, perhaps, in our generation has accepted so completely the guidance of God as the be-all and end-all of living, as the golden thread running through every day.[15]

This guidance, received not only by Buchman but by all the members of MRA, has no mark of divine authority on it. There is no guarantee that it will remain the same from year to year, or even among different members. In short, it can hardly serve as the basis for an authenticated worship of God.

But there is no need to prove that MRA is a religion to find reasons why participation in it is at least dangerous. Granting, for the present, with Arnold Lunn, that "MRA is a religious discipline but it is not a religion,"[16] it is plain that the movement can easily lead to a contempt of legitimate authority both inside and outside the Church. If each member of society is allowed to hear the voice of God through personal revelation, the variety of interpretations of the divine will becomes infinite. The Protestant churches have some sort of tradition, and even under its restraint they are constantly developing and evolving. With no governing code of tradition, MRA would present a truth varying according to the whims of each individual. For Catholics, a complete subscription to Moral Rearmament would mean the heresy of illuminism, in which every person receives the immediate guidance of the Holy Spirit independently of the Church's authority.

If the above tendency were not too much to be feared, the danger of the spirit of indifferentism cannot be denied. Any movement which finds "Catholic, Jew and Protestant, Hindu, Muslim, Buddhist and Confucianist"[17] talking and planning moral-religious issues in common can lead at best to a dilution of the already adequate body of truths possessed by the Catholic Church.

Moral Rearmament is anti-intellectual in its facile solution of the social problems that have vexed humanity since the dawn of history. Its obtuseness to these problems as nothing more than faulty, selfish personal attitudes to be solved by evangelical revivalism, is

[15] *Ibid.*, p. xix.
[16] *Tablet*, 204 (Sept. 18, 1954), 283.
[17] *Remaking the World*, p. 166.

at least naive. MRA is also anti-intellectual in its appeal to the masses as a world force and world view to which, step by step, a person is brought "to commit himself irrevocably,"[18] and then have every thought and action of his life determined accordingly. The absoluteness of this dedication cannot be questioned:

> What would it mean for America to rearm morally? It would mean the uniting of our nation in every part of its life on a constructive plan. We need to find once again the power of a united mind. *We must leave our causes,* many of them excellent causes, *and find this common cause.* We shall find the force that will forge amiable individualists into a united nation.[19]

CHURCH'S STATEMENTS ON MORAL REARMAMENT

A decree of the Holy Office of August 8, 1951, makes the following provisions:

1. It is not fitting for either diocesan or religious priests, and much less for nuns, to participate in meetings of Moral Rearmament.

2. If exceptional circumstances should make such participation opportune, the permission of the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office must be requested beforehand. This permission will be granted only to learned and experienced priests.

3. Finally, it is not fitting that the faithful should accept posts of responsibility in Moral Rearmament, and especially not fitting that they join the so-called "policy team."[20]

Individual bishops have been more specific. In 1946 the Bishops of England and Wales stated:

> This movement is so tainted with indifferentism, with the error that one religion is as good as another, that no Catholic may take any active part in such a movement or formally co-operate. Catholics should be warned not even to attend the meetings or gatherings even as spectators.[21]

Cardinal Schuster, Archbishop of Milan, condemned MRA in 1952 on the ground that the movement "follows a Protestant sys-

[18] Buchman, Frank N. D., *Remaking Men* (London), p. 76.

[19] *Remaking the World,* p. 125. Emphasis added.

[20] Taken from *AER,* 133 (Nov., 1955), p. 351. It is interesting to note that this statement about MRA follows the decree of the Holy Office on the Rotary by only a few months.

[21] Quoted in *Tablet,* 204 (Aug. 14, 1954), p. 258.

tem, because, by lightly by-passing the Catholic Church, the only one charged by Christ with transmitting to souls the treasures of the Redemption, it would directly place souls in contact with God and His grace." It is dangerous for both non-Catholics, to whom it offers "a morality without dogma, without a principle of authority, without a supremely revealed faith," making them "sheep without a shepherd," and for Catholics also, because, if they go to Caux, all they find is "a subjective pietism of the authentic Protestant stamp."[22]

Thus, while MRA has something to give to those who are outside the true faith, it has little to offer to believing Catholics. All that is good in MRA they already have in undiluted form in the teachings of Christ and the Church. "The Catholic Church owes it to herself," says Bishop Suenens, Auxiliary Bishop of Malines, Belgium, "to ask to see the credentials of any prophet who comes forward, in whatever manner, claiming to be sent by the Holy Spirit. . . . The moment they speak a religious language, Buchman and his disciples must answer this same question: 'Where is the guarantee of your authenticity'."[23] In the absence of an answer, Moral Rearmament must be left to go its own way without the collaboration of Catholics.

RALPH J. BASTIAN, S.J.
JOHN A. HARDON, S.J.

West Baden College
West Baden Springs, Ind.

[22] Quoted in *Tablet,* 199 (June 28, 1952), p. 525.
[23] Leon-Joseph Suenens, *The Right View of Moral Re-Armament,* London, 1954, pp. 36-37.

AN ASIDE TO THE MARIOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION OF *GENESIS* 3:14

Recently the following conclusion regarding the Mariological interpretation of Gen. 3:14 was published, ". . . Catholic tradition holds with moral unanimity that the 'woman' of the Protoevangelium is Mary in a true and proper bibical sense, intended and willed by God Himself. If this is the 'literal' or the 'typical' or the 'full' is a question about which exegetes are not in accord."[1]

As a general rule for the interpretation of Sacred Scripture from the teaching of the Fathers we can state that if they are in morally unanimous accord in declaring that a text has a particular meaning the text does have that meaning and that such is intended by God. If, however, they gave their opinion as only probable, some contrary opinion would not necessarily be excluded.[2] The same rules can be applied to later interpretations.[3]

Before the Bull *Munificentissimus* a number of Catholic authors did not admit the Mariological interpretation of the "woman" of Gen. 3:14.[4] Since 1950 many authors have indeed subscribed to the opinion in some fashion;[5] however, the first question which arises is whether or not their accord is such as to produce a morally unanimous agreement.

[1] A. Bea, S.J., "Maria S.S. nel Protoevangelio," *Marianum,* XV (1953), 20; cited by G. Filograssi, S.J., "Il dogma dell' Immacolata nell' Enciclica 'Fulgens Corona'," *Gregorianum,* XXXVI (1955), 10. Inasmuch as Father Bea used "senso pieno" a most literal translation was given; a complete discussion of what should be the English term may be found in R. Brown, S.S., *The Sensus Plenior of Sacred Scripture* (Baltimore: St. Mary's University, 1955), pp. 88 f.

[2] Cfr. A. Fernandez, S.J., in *Institutiones Biblicae*[6] (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1951), pp. 479 f.; H. Hoepfl, O.S.B.-B. Gut, O.S.B., *Introductio Generalis in Sacram Scripturam* (Naples: D'Auria, 1950), pp. 535 f.

[3] Cfr. S. Cartechini, S.J., *De Valore Notarum Theologicarum* (Rome: Gregorian University, 1951), pp. 191 f.

[4] Cfr. F. Ceuppens, O.P., *Quaestiones Selectae ex Historia Primaeva*[2] (Turin: Marietti, 1948), p. 204.

[5] Cfr. Filograssi, *art. cit.,* p. 9.

Father Ceuppens, who at one time did not admit the Mariological interpretation of the word,[6] after considering the four possible interpretations, viz. that the woman is Mary alone in the literal sense, Eve alone in the literal sense, Eve in the literal and Mary in the typical sense, and Eve in the literal and Mary in the full sense, states, "These different opinions are proposed and propounded by Catholic authors: we think however . . . that the fourth opinion is more probable."[7] It seems, too, that at least one other exegete tends to deny the Mariological interpretation of the verse.[8] Do such hesitant opinions of themselves contribute to the necessary accord of interpreters? Perhaps we are still too near to the pre-1950 era for judging with certainty about any moral unanimity among commentators regarding the particular word in Sacred Scripture.

The most interesting consideration raised by the above mentioned conclusion regards the possibility of unanimous accord in interpretation when the various opinions making up this general consent are really distinct. The question is of itself of much wider scope than the consideration of the identity of the "woman" of the Protevangelium.

The morally unanimous consent of interpreters in rejecting a possible signification as opposed to Faith must be followed even though the commentators do not agree as to the positive content of the passage.[9] It would also be true that their unanimous consent to the statement that a particular meaning did not exhaust the literal meaning of a text would have to be followed. If, however, all postulated a typical sense for a particular text but were not in accord in determining just what the type was, they would not have to be followed; the typical sense can be known only from revelation and if the type is not known, one cannot know that such a type exists since it is the type which is revealed directly and not that a typical meaning is found in a given text.

[6] *Loc. cit.*

[7] *Mariologica Biblica*[2] (Turin: Marietti, 1951), p. 17.

[8] R. De Vaux, O.P., *La Genèse* in *Bible de Jérusalem* (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1951), p. 48: "Les applications de ce texte a la Vierge Marie se fondent sur la traduction latine qui substitua au masculin du grec un pronom féminin, se référant à la première femme, et sur le parallèle qu'on reconnut entre Eve et Marie."

[9] Hoepfl-Gut, *op. cit.*, p. 536.

The question becomes even more complex when the general meaning is expounded by different commentators in different ways. To use the word "woman" of Gen. 3:14 as an example, we find that some reject all mention of Eve in the text, while others demand the literal understanding of the word as Eve while Mary may be signified in various manners. These opinions are mutually exclusive. He who states that Mary alone is meant denies that Mary is meant typically or that Eve is signified at all; he who states that Mary is meant only typically rejects any literal application of the text to her; he who holds that Mary is meant in the full sense demands a literal reference of the text to both Mary and Eve while denying any typology to the word.

What then is to be said of the hypothesis of general agreement? If the proponents of the general interpretation agree in censuring the mutually rejected opinion, their censure would have to be accepted provided of course that the censure was a truly dogmatic one.[10] If the rejection of the censured opinion necessarily demanded the affirmation in some way of the general opinion, then such would have to be affirmed although it might not be clear how it was to be affirmed. When, however, an opinion is not censured but simply rejected by the proponents of seemingly concurrent opinions, we must judge from the nature of the opinions. Only in virtue of his positive interpretation does a commentator reject other opinions, that is the interpreter states directly what in his opinion is the positive content of the text and then implicitly or consequently rejects all other opinions. When the exponents of the apparently general opinion by arguments that are really distinct and mutually exclusive, reach conclusions that are really distinct and mutually exclusive, there is no accord as to positive content, for each commentator rejects every opinion not consonant with his. Mutual discord does not effect mutual agreement.

When there would be universal rejection of an opinion by a number of commentators who proposed mutually exclusive positive explanations, and when the respective proponents of the apparently common opinion reject all opinions not in accord with their own particular interpretations in the same manner, the commonly re-

[10] By censure is here meant some note stating that the opinion is incompatible with faith.

jected opinion would not seem to be such that it could not at a later date be proposed safely.[11]

JOHN J. O'ROURKE

St. Charles Seminary
Overbrook, Philadelphia

[11] No attempt has been made here to determine how the text of Gen. 3:14 should be interpreted.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The anonymous leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for October, 1906, is entitled "The Sovereign Pontiff to His Bishops." It is a commentary on the Pastoral Letter of Pope St. Pius X, sent on July 28, 1906, to the Bishops of Italy. One of the points emphasized by the Sovereign Pontiff is that men should not be ordained to the priesthood merely because they desire that dignity, but that the selection of candidates for Holy Orders should be made in accordance with the needs of the diocese and the prescriptions of the Council of Trent. The writer of the article says, in conclusion: "The Papal Letter is a magnificent document. And whilst it is in the first place addressed to the Bishops of Italy in their own tongue, its warnings, its prescriptions and cautions are such as must appeal to every one who has at heart the welfare of souls." . . . Fr. John T. McNicholas, O.P., contributes a scholarly article on "The Ordinary Confessor of Nuns," explaining the qualifications demanded by Canon Law in the priest assigned to hear the confessions of religious women. . . . An anonymous novel entitled *A Story of Sixes and Sevens* begins in this issue. It is a story of clerical life and seems to be concerned mainly with church music. . . . Fr. A. Maas, S.J., discusses the recent decree of the Biblical Commission on the authorship of the Pentateuch. . . . Fr. R. H. Benson, of England, contributes another chapter of his novel *A Mirror of Shalott,* dealing with events of a preternatural nature. . . . Fr. P. A. Baart writes on "Ownership and Administration of Church Property," treating particularly of the methods in use in the United States. . . . Fr. F. P. Siegfried, of Overbrook, gives a review of a new *Dictionary of Philosophy* by Abbé Blanc, of the Catholic University of Lyons. . . . A writer in the Studies and Conferences section suggests as a means of encouraging frequent Holy Communion that the faithful be informed each Sunday of the indulgences they can gain through the reception of the Holy Eucharist on the various feasts of the coming week. . . . Another correspondent, signing himself "Clericus," proposes some suggestions for putting into practice the Pope's decree on sacred music.

F. J. C.

LEA, COULTON AND ANTI-CATHOLICISM

Part II

In our previous article we remarked that the willingness of many respectable Protestants to believe the most damaging charges against the Catholic Church on altogether insufficient evidence is a perennial source of astonishment to born Catholics. We have indicated that there seem to be two special and large scale sources depended upon for the anti-Catholic indictment; these two are the historical writings of the English George Gordon Coulton and the American Henry Charles Lea. We have already given considerable evidence purporting to show that neither the background nor the personality of Coulton was such as would be likely to qualify him as an expert and reliable witness against the Catholic Church in the field of his specialty, the medieval monastery. Moreover, the outspoken strictures of Coulton's competent fellow non-Catholic historians give us abundant reason to question that his performance in appraising monastery life was fairer than his promise. We have mentioned, too, that later in our study of the second of the anti-Catholic historians, Dr. Lea, we would find his trail and Coulton's crossing in a way that would enable us to come to an interesting conclusion of both men on much the same evidence. But first let us turn to Lea himself.

Lea's historical ranking was sufficient to raise him to the presidency of the American Historical Association. He was given honorary degrees, too, by the Universities of Giessen, Pennsylvania, Harvard, and Princeton, and a welcome into the ranks of more than thirty learned societies in half a dozen countries. Of his historical objectivity we are told by friendly critics, "No biologist, chemist, or astronomer has been more true to . . . canons of scientific method than has Mr. Lea in his historical works."[1] William E. Lecky, the English historian of morals, describes *Sacerdotal Celibacy* as "certainly one of the most valuable works that America has produced."[2] Lord Bryce calls Lea "one of the greatest his-

[1] *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society,* I (Philadelphia, 1911), xv.

[2] Edward Sculley Bradley, *Henry Charles Lea: A Biography* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1931), p. 132.

torians of our time."[3] Bryce adds, "In accompanying him one feels one's self always on firm ground . . . this work of his . . . will perpetuate his name and win for it a gratitude of many generations of historical scholars."[4] The University of Pennsylvania historian, Edward Potts Cheyney, asks of Lea: "What later travelers along the way of historical study will see so widely, observe so keenly and record so well as has this first and greatest of American scientific historians?"[5] Of more recent appraisals, the *Guide to Historical Literature* says of him,

> Lea's works constitute the most important contribution to European history made by any American scholar. They are based on original sources, and owe less than most histories to the investigations of other scholars. Lea's independence of judgment is fortified by great critical ability and a vast knowledge of medieval literature.[6]

One of our popular encyclopedias (cited here because of its influence upon the average reader) brings that judgment down to date:

> Lea's command of source material was unrivaled. . . . Lea was hailed as one of the greatest scholars America has ever produced. To Europeans, who recognized his distinction before his fellow Americans did, he was a notable figure indeed.[7]

If the anti-Catholic writings of Lea are deserving of such praise then the Church has in him a most damaging opponent. Are there any objective reasons for questioning the fairness of his writings and the justice of his rating? Let us look into his background, into the circumstances of his authorship, and his professed attitude towards the Catholic Church. These may throw some light on the probable fairness of his indictment. We will then turn our attention to an examination of his finished work, basing our judgment on the critiques of proved scholars.

As to the Lea background and manner of authorship, he was a professed Unitarian offspring of an Irish Catholic line, his mother having been "bred" a Catholic, daughter of Mathew Carey, the Philadelphia publisher. (Was Lea's inveterate anti-Catholic

[3] *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, I, xxiv.
[4] *Ibid.*, pp. xxvi, xxix.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. xxix.
[6] William Henry Allison, ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1931), p. 263.
[7] *Collier's Encyclopedia* (New York, Collier and Son, 1954).

interest the product of a guilt-feeling consequent upon the religious shift?) As to the circumstances of his authorship, he lacked all formal academic training for historical research. For thirty-seven years—that it, until he was fifty-five years old—he was actively engaged in his large publishing business. And yet, despite those professional handicaps, Lea made a fetish of reliance upon his own powers. As Professor Cheyney has remarked, "No scholar ever worked more absolutely independently than he, few ever worked more completely alone. He never employed a secretary or clerk, never dictated a letter."[8]

With no bibliographical aids and no professional associates who might advise, this self-trained businessman addressed himself to the new and most controversial field of religious history, notably medieval, covering much of Europe and South America. Prevented by his business activities—and an extraordinarily active interest in civic affairs, both local and national—from making his own archival researches, he depended upon paid copyists working in all the principal libraries of Europe and in Latin America. His task it was to appraise, interpret, digest, and put order into that flood of manuscripts from another civilization and another age. With no formal training in Catholic dogma, scripture, moral theology or canon law, he would interpret stacks of documents of which these difficult sciences are the necessary key.

In addition to those immense difficulties, Lea suffered from continuous ill-health. Of that matter Lea himself remarked, "Here I am at sixty-eight, after a life of valetudinarianism, and never feeling certain as to my condition from day to day. . . ."[9] Twice he was forced to abandon his writing, for an aggregate period of perhaps thirteen years. Nevertheless, in addition to scores of magazine articles, he composed eighteen stout volumes—almost entirely anti-Catholic—on such difficult and controversial topics as the Inquisition, Sacerdotal Celibacy, the History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences, Superstition, and Witchcraft. What human likelihood was there that they would be adequately written?

Regarding the spirit in which he wrote of the Catholic Church, Lea gives us some suggestion in the preface of his *History of Auricular Confession*. There he contends that by intelligently

[8] Bradley, *op. cit.*, p. 261.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 299.

collocating (necessarily according to his own value-judgments) "a vast aggregate of details, many of them apparently trivial," he can show how the Church structure "gradually arose which subjugated Christendom beneath its vast and majestic omnipotence." His investigations, he further tells us, show how in the growth of dogma, "every detail once settled becomes the point of departure in new and perhaps wholly unexpected directions." His revelations of the Catholic Church he is assured are of no merely theoretical and historical importance: think of the power that is hers today through the "rule of the ballot box." Moreover, "Through the instrumentality of the confessional, the sodality and the indulgence [her] matchless organization is . . . enabled to concentrate in the Vatican a power greater than has ever before been wielded by human hands."[10] Lea continued to pride himself on his open-mindedness toward the Catholic Church, yet to William Lecky, a kindred soul, he could confide,

> I have been going through a course of reading for the last year or two which brings strongly before me the wonderful hold that Catholic superstitions have on the average man. The numberless methods which have been invented to smooth the path to Heaven are almost incredible, and their grossness passes belief.[11]

The above are our reflections on Lea's background, the circumstances of his labors, and his attitude towards the Catholic Church. Our next consideration is concerned with the judgment passed on the Lea anti-Catholic indictment by his contemporary non-Catholic historical confreres. Lea, as we have already remarked, has been conceded by some of his admirers the title of first of the scientific historians of our country. We are questioning that he deserved the title. But it is true that many other writers of history of his time had little better claim. It could still be said of the then historical situation, using the words of the editors of the *Cambridge Modern History,*

> The honest student finds himself continually deserted, retarded, misled by the classics of historical literature, and has to hew his own way . . . in order to reach the truth. Ultimate history cannot be obtained in this generation; but so far as documentary evidence is at command, conventional history can be discarded.[12]

---

[10] Vol. I (Philadelphia: Lea Bros., 1896), v and vi.

[11] Bradley, *op. cit.,* pp. 297 f.

[12] Vol. I (Cambridge: University Press, 1907), preface v and vi.

Probably as a consequence of such American lack of historical scholarship, Lea's volumes were given little critical review by American journals. But he did not fare as well in Europe. In view of the circumstances of his authorship which we have already described, it would have been miraculous had not such defects been found in his work as these pointed out in the able London *Athenaeum:*

> He makes use of the writings of Christendom and is familiar with all the centuries. Obscure men are elevated to places of authority, and there is no higher position for the great. Amidst a mass of details and an endless catalogue of names the writer is lost, and the reader too.[13]

In that volume being reviewed by the *Athenaeum* critic, Lea devotes a chapter to the difficult specialist problems of Probabilism and Casuistry. Of that chapter his critic remarks: "It is a confused and commonplace attack on doctrines held by Catholic writers, and sometimes is a travesty of them." Of Lea's comments on the use of sacramental confession, the *Athenaeum* writer says, "An anti-Popery lecturer could not do better than this: 'The confessional thus is rendered, not an instrumentality to make men better and stronger, but to follow their baser instincts and teach them how to transgress the laws of God without paying the penalty, for if God cannot be obeyed without too great a sacrifice, he can at least be cheated.'" The *Athenaeum* critic concludes: "Dr. Lea shows in this book how a learned writer lacking style becomes dull, and how an historian can become a bitter partisan."[14]

Catholic rejoinders—both American and European—to the Lea indictments have been many, some by able theologians, others by competent historians; but in general they have been waved aside as obscurantist. Among the Americans who made reply was P. H. Casey, S.J., Professor of Dogmatic Theology, Woodstock College, Maryland. As a fair sample of Lea's method, Father Casey examines, line by line, ten pages of the *History of Auricular Confession,* Vol. I. After seventy-eight pages of his commentary, Father Casey concludes:

[13] Sept. 19, 1896, p. 384, review of *History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church,* Vol. II.

[14] *Ibid.*

The question that Mr. Lea has been treating in this section is the vital question of the whole work; and nevertheless what false assumptions, what unwarranted conclusions, what suppressions of truth, what perverted representations of patristic teaching, in a word, what methods of the special pleader have we not discovered in his pages? Mr. Lea is not a historian, but an advocate; a writer not of history, but of polemics. . . . He summons up his witnesses from antiquity, good and bad alike, heretic or orthodox, all are acceptable if only they may be coerced into an utterance to suit his purpose. If they utter nothing at all, their silence is construed into evident testimony in favor of his cause. If they prove recalcitrant and are bent on giving evidence against him, then he tries to show that they are "inconsistent."[15]

Father Casey's detailed, chapter and verse reply to the Lea indictment was largely ignored by Lea's admirers: Father Casey was no historian, only a theologian. (But many of the documents were theological.) Fortunately, no such evasion could be practiced regarding an examination given Lea by Herbert Thurston, S.J., the English historian. Thurston began his examination with a review of Lea's chapter, "Eve of the Reformation," from the first volume of the *Cambridge Modern History.* (Lea's authorized biography says of that chapter, "No work of Lea has excited more admiration of scholars."[16]) Having pointed out the chapter's manifold misrepresentations, Father Thurston remarked:

A wholly reckless and inaccurate writer like Dr. Lea enjoys a certain immunity from criticism, from the very fact that his misconceptions are so often too fundamental to be investigated in a few minutes or explained in a few lines. . . . It would be a safe thing probably to say that in any ten consecutive pages ten palpable blunders may be unearthed. At any rate I should like to submit that estimate to the test of experiment.

Thurston then inquires, "Would Dr. Lea, I wonder, be prepared to accept such a challenge, and to elect to stand or fall by the third volume of his *History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences* or his chapter on the causes of the Reformation in the *Cambridge Modern History?*"[17]

[15] *Notes on the History of Auricular Confession* (Philadelphia: John Jos. McVey, 1899), pp. 78 f.

[16] Bradley, *op. cit.*, p. 311.

[17] "Dr. H. C. Lea on the Causes of the Reformation," *American Catholic Quarterly Review,* July 1903, p. 434.

That challenge gave Lea an easy opportunity of vindication from the charge of bigotry. And the entire burden of proof would fall upon Thurston. There would be no lack of Lea admirers to point out any failure of proof, should Lea prefer to remain aloof. The challenge had been issued in Lea's own home city, Philadelphia, in a serious magazine, by a competent historian. Yet, despite the fact that Lea was keenly alert to reviews of his works, and was still six years from the end of his writing career, he made no reply.

Thirty-three years later the challenge was happened upon by that castigator of all things Catholic, G. G. Coulton. At once he hurled his defy at Thurston, now eighty years of age and within two years of the grave: "I assert with every sense of responsibility [Coulton stormed] that your challenge is libellous and false to a ludicrous and almost inconceivable degree."[18] Coulton continued to press the point: "In 1903 you undertook to expose Lea . . . as a wholly reckless and inaccurate writer by a specific test of your own choice—ten palpable blunders in any ten out of 1600 pages." Then followed five pages of goading taunts to Thurston to make good his challenge of a generation before.[19]

The volume Coulton designated for the test was not one originally mentioned by Thurston but the latter waived the point; the ten test pages were a chance selection by a third party of Coulton's choice. Coulton threw in a half-page at either end of the section chosen, in order that the paragraphs might be kept whole, then reiterated his challenge: "I defy you to find even a single patent blunder in all those twelve pages."

That was in November, 1936; in the January and February, 1937, issues of the *Month* Thurston proved at length fifteen "palpable blunders" in the test section. Coulton neither then nor later questioned the validity of that proof. He even acknowledged that "Father Thurston has damaged Lea's accuracy in those ten pages more than I expected."[20] Coulton contended that the passage chosen was a "particularly vulnerable section of Lea's book."[21]

[18] *Month,* January 1937, pp. 52 f.

[19] Joseph Crehan, S.J., *Father Thurston: A Memoir* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1952), pp. 151 f.

[20] *Month,* October 1937, p. 310.

[21] Crehan, *op. cit.,* p. 155.

That chance test-boring into the works of Lea we feel serves the double purpose of discrediting his pretension to historical competence and to objectivity. Whatever were his good intentions, his well wishing, he found it impossible to treat fairly the several phases of Catholic history to which he addressed himself. Historical research surely must mean something more than "bundles from Britain," bundles of documents copied and consigned by largely uncontrolled wage earners. And if Thurston's demonstration was so damaging to Lea's reputation, where does it leave Coulton?[22] It was Coulton who thought so highly of the accuracy of the test volume that he would not be silenced until he had forced Thurston to meet the test. Even when the ten pages had been chosen, Coulton so respected their accuracy that he defied Thurston to find in them "a single palpable blunder."

To all such Catholic efforts to point out the unfairness of the Lea indictment, there has been one supposedly all-sufficient reply: Lord Acton, Regius Professor of Modern History, Cambridge University, and editor of the *Cambridge Modern History,* the "greatest Catholic historian," had importuned Lea to write for that History the all-important chapter, "The Eve of the Reformation." Acton's words to Lea were, "It is clear that you are the one indicated and predestined writer, there is no one else. . . . I know of none whom I could go to if you refuse."[23] Catholics, however, have not been impressed by that citation of Acton. Lord Acton seems unimpressive either as historian or Catholic. Perhaps, as it is claimed, he had read everything and remembered all he had read. But what evidence did he give of balanced historical judgment? And where are his evidences of trained research accepted by acknowledged historians? That "greatest Catholic historian" "did not write a book of any kind, small or great."[24] The book he spent a lifetime talking about and planning for—the history of

[22] It seems suggestive that whereas Coulton is not among the contributors to the scholarly non-Catholic Hastings' *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics,* Edinburgh, 1924, Thurston has there a dozen articles, some of them, including that on the Jesuits, dealing with controversial subjects.

[23] Edward Potts Cheyney, *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society,* I (1911), p. xviii.

[24] Herbert Paul, ed., *Letters of Lord Acton to Mary Gladstone* (London: George Allen, 1904), Memoir, p. lxxv.

liberty—remains "the greatest book that never was written";[25] in fact, it was never even begun.[26] Acton's chief contribution to historical science was his brief editorship of the *Cambridge Modern History,* an editorship that ended in his death before the first volume was off the press.

And as a Catholic, was he more impressive? He repeatedly expressed unquestioning faith in Catholicism, but that faith did not seem to extend to its hierarchical government or teaching authority. Our evidence in this matter will be largely his own writings, most of them from his mature years. Thus our citations from the *Letters of Lord Acton to Mary Gladstone* cover the years 1879 to 1886, his forty-fifth to fifty-second year. In fact, those letters may fairly be taken to represent his mind substantially unto the end. Question of their publication arose in 1898, four years before his death. Lord Acton, with certain reservations, assented. Those who tell us that fact are they who published the letters in 1904, after his death. It is to be supposed that they respected his "certain reservations."[27] Glancing then through Acton's life we note such things as these: despite the fact that the Catholic Church is essentially papal, the papacy met with Acton's habitual scorn. Thus, to a personal friend he writes,

> The papacy contrived murder and massacred on the largest and also on the most cruel and inhuman scale. They were not only wholesale assassins, but they made the principle of assassination a law of the Christian Church and a condition of Salvation. [The papacy was the] fiend skulking behind the Crucifix.[28]

Papal infallibility in solemn and final declarations of sainthood has been Catholic doctrine at least since the Vatican Council. But twelve years after the Council—and repeatedly thereafter—Acton could write,

> [Saint] Pius the Fifth held that it was sound Catholic doctrine that any man may stab a heretic condemned by Rome, and that every man is a heretic who attacks the papal prerogatives. [Saint Charles] Borromeo

---

[25] Gertrude Himmelfarb, *Lord Acton: A Study in Conscience and Politics* (University of Chicago Press, 1952), p. 2.

[26] *Letters of Lord Acton,* p. lvi.

[27] *Letters . . .,* p. vii.

[28] Himmelfarb, *op. cit.,* p. 151.

wrote a letter for the purpose of causing a few Protestants to be murdered. Newman is an avowed admirer of Saint Pius and Saint Charles, and of the pontiffs who canonized them. This, and the like of this, is the reason for my deep aversion for him.[29]

Lord Acton's scorn reached to even the ecumenical council. Of Trent he wrote three hundred years after it had begun so mightily the Catholic Reformation: "The Council of Trent impressed on the Church the stamp of an intolerant age, and perpetuated by its decrees the spirit of an austere immorality."[30] This contempt was even intensified for the Vatican Council. When in Rome, after long and desperate battling against the definition of papal infallibility, Acton's cause seemed in greatest peril, he

> . . . persuaded Gladstone to release a letter expressing English displeasure with the idea of papal infallibility. . . . And he alerted Gladstone to the successive acts of hostility by which "the papal absolutism" declared war against "the rights of the Church, of the State and of the Intellect". . . . Without the intercession of the governments, he warned, the new "papal aggression" was certain to succeed.[31]

Even after the papal infallibility decree had been passed by the Vatican Council, Acton published over his own name an open letter urging the minority bishops to ultimate resistance: "The only invincible opponent is the man who is prepared, in extremity, to defy excommunication."[32] In that open letter he recapitulated the evidence purporting to prove that the council was a "conspiracy against divine truth and law" and the dogma a "soul-destroying error. . . ." He concluded, "One must persevere to the end and give the world an example of courage and constancy which it so greatly needs."[33]

The excommunication of his co-conspirator, Dr. Döllinger, in no way deterred Acton from his course of opposition. Six years after the Council he wrote Gladstone,

[29] *Letters,* p. 135. Concerning the charges against St. Charles and St. Pius, cf. Thurston, London *Tablet,* July 15 and 29, 1905, pp. 88-90, 167-169.

[30] *Letters,* p. xxxi.

[31] Himmelfarb, *op. cit.,* p. 104 f.

[32] *Ibid.,* p. 109.

[33] *Ibid.,* p. 110.

I do not know of a religious and educated Catholic who really believes that the See of Rome is a safe guide to salvation. . . . In short, I do not believe there are Catholics who, sincerely and intelligently, believe that Rome is right and that Döllinger is wrong.[34]

Steeled against the threat of excommunication, Acton wrote a friend, "It is simply at the choice of the authorities, Pope, Cardinal, bishop or priest, when I am excommunicated. . . . It can only be a question of time."[35] The excommunication never came; it happened that his bishop was an old schoolmaster of his, ready to overlook much in the brilliant but rather hysterical young aristocrat.[36]

The points of Catholic teaching that Acton held were—as far as the eye can see—such as could be held by a High Church Anglican. He and Prime Minister Gladstone religiously had much in common. As the Protestant Herbert Paul, editor of *Letters of Lord Acton to Mary Gladstone,* has said, "Even in religion that which divided them was small indeed when compared with that which united them."[37] Paul remarks, too, that, characteristically, Acton's favorite among moral philosophers of his day was a Protestant. In fact, in such matters the question of denomination meant so little to Acton, according to Paul, that Acton ". . . would not have crossed the room to make ten proselytes. . . . Those who feared God and followed Christ in every nation belonged to his household of faith."[38]

Perhaps still more shocking to a Catholic convinced of the unique and divine origin of his Church was Acton's indifference to the excommunication and apostasy of his almost lifelong friend, Father Döllinger. Even when the apostate lay on his deathbed, Acton urged that Döllinger's wishes be respected that "the last rites be administered by an Old Catholic rather than a Roman priest."[39]

Such flaunting of the customary standards of Catholic living finally met with the anti-Catholic government's reward. Acton in

[34] *Letters,* p. lv.
[35] Himmlfarb, *op. cit.,* p. 124.
[36] *Ibid.,* p. 123.
[37] *Letters,* Memoir, p. lxi.
[38] *Ibid.,* pp. xix f.
[39] Himmelfarb, *op. cit.,* p. 233.

his sixtieth year was appointed, by Gladstone's successor, to the Regius professorship of Modern History, Cambridge University. As Acton's biographer suggests, "The reward was a testimonial to his scholarship and perhaps even to his unorthodox views, both of which might now receive a sympathetic hearing."[40] Acton continued his castigations of Rome from his national stage. We hear him demanding of his collegiate hearers, "Are you aware that [St. Charles] Borromeo was a party to a scheme of assassinations?"[41] Such anti-Catholic charges from this Regius professor were not rare: "It seems to have been a common criticism during the years of his Cambridge professorship . . . that Acton had 'Inquisition on the brain.' "[42] Within a year of his Regius appointment he had also been advanced to the editorship of the projected *Cambridge Modern History.*

It was only a week after announcement of the plans of the new and notable publishing project that Lord Acton wrote Lea, inviting and urging him to contribute to the first volume of the series the key chapter, that on the Eve of the Reformation. For Acton that preference of the anti-Catholic was only following a lifetime pattern. Acton might even have asked what else he could do. Could he give to the very critical inception of the great historical series a tone clashing with the vast majority group's fixed ideas of the meaning and character of the so-called Reformation? But in any event, in view of all that we have shown of Lord Acton, let not his choice of Lea be urged upon Catholics as the all-sufficient evidence of Lea's historical objectivity.

To sum up our remarks regarding Henry Charles Lea and George Gordon Coulton: we think the evidence plain that neither of those chief historian resources of anti-Catholic indictment was a man likely to give his readers a balanced judgment of the place and influence of the Catholic Church during the periods of which he treats. We think we have shown, too, abundant reason to doubt that either historian, in fact, arrived at a balanced judgment of the Church. The English language version of history, as we have found the Oxford historian, Cecil Roth, insisting, is definitely anti-

[40] *Ibid.*, p. 193.

[41] *Letters,* pp. lxxi f.

[42] Thurston, "The Late Lord Acton," *Catholic World,* December 1906, p. 369.

Catholic. Within that larger story, the Lea-Coulton version of history is a perversion and should no longer be relied upon even popularly as justifying hostility to Rome.

JOHN E. COOGAN, S.J.

University of Detroit
Detroit, Michigan

LONELINESS AND THE EUCHARIST

One of the most poignant things that can afflict the human heart is loneliness. Other sorrows can be shared and so assuaged; but loneliness throws the heart back on itself and leaves it to suffer unaided. Solitary confinement can be a more dreaded sentence than death.

And, to a point, loneliness is inseparable from our priesthood. We are segregated men, and segregation has its burdens as well as its privileges. There is naturally more room for loneliness in the life of the secular priest than in that of the member of a Religious Order, though he, too, particularly on the foreign mission field, may experience extreme isolation as he "ploughs his lonely furrow" in the midst of savagery and paganism. Even in the din and bustle of civilization the loneliness of the priest working in non-Catholic surroundings can be acute. His *pusillus grex* is so very small. He feels he is living in another world from the one about him and that he is alone in it.

For all that the priest retains his human heart. A poor priest he would be had he lost it. Ordination has not filched it from him. Now we are told that nature abhors a vacuum. Our heart abhors it more. Our heart must love and be loved. The vacuum must be filled, as far as may be, even before we get to heaven, by loves of some sort. As we know, there are loves to which we must bar an entry, to which our dedicated heart must ever say an unrelenting "No." There are indeed loves, human and honourable, which our priesthood has never renounced—the loves of relatives and friends —which Christ Himself has hallowed by His own example. But these share the instability of human things: age, distance, shifting circumstances, death gradually thin their ranks. And so there are moments when the vacuum in our priest's heart can be an aching void and when we can feel really lonely.

Of all of us who feel this loneliness I would respectfully ask: are we making enough of our Eucharistic Friend so close, so constantly close to us? Are we exploiting the possibilities of this constant closeness, which in our case are so great? The mystery of the Eucharist is on a plane all its own. We priests may not all feel at home, like an Augustine or an Aquinas, in plumbing

the depths of the Trinity; but there is something about the Eucharist, something so human as well as divine, that lends itself to contemplation for the least gifted among us and leads to the most practical application in our daily life. Once we have grasped the sublime, though simple, fact of transubstantiation and the resulting Real Presence, there is room for an ever-growing vividness of apprehension, for endless reflection, for the most practical conclusions—conclusions that can be drawn by a child of seven as well as by the trained theologian.

We have all read of the wonderful reactions to the mystery of the Eucharist displayed by saintly priests. We can all be saintly without such reactions. But the point is that the theological facts of the Eucharist are just as much facts for the least appreciative among us as they were for a Philip Neri for instance, or a Curé d'Ars. It is we who differentiate in our behaviour towards this great gift, not Christ who gave it. These holy priests received great graces indeed, but were not such favours in proportion to the vividness of their faith? We read of prisoners setting up contact with one another by all sorts of ingenious ways through the thickest dungeon walls. And so vivid was the faith of certain saintly priests that even here below the dividing wall between faith and vision seemed, as it were, to have worn thin and made possible that wonderful relationship we read of between them and their Eucharistic Lord. We need not look for this, but the Eucharist is a mystery that will grow into an ever-increasing practical reality with our growing faith. This will be true wherever and whatever may be our priestly mission. Where the Real Presence is concerned there are no objective grades of reality. It is as real on the improvised altar on a battlefield as in a cathedral.

Now all this is as true for the layman as for the priest, but on the life of the priest it has an incalculably greater bearing. We priests are the instrumental causes of the Eucharist. We give Christ His sacramental being. We are charged with its keeping, and surely the Eucharist should mean immeasurably more to us than to any others in the world.

Now among the many means of intensifying our Eucharistic devotion may be suggested the occasional recalling to mind the tremendous theology of the Eucharist. And perhaps we could do this in no pleasanter or more fruitful way than by reading

meditatively from time to time the Office and Mass of the feast of Corpus Christi, with its entire Octave. As priests we have always our Missal and our *Pars aestiva* at hand. This reading will repay us. In the Mass for the feast, besides the words of Christ Himself on the essential nature and purpose of Holy Communion and the words of St. Paul narrating the bestowing of this great gift, we have that wonderful Sequence—*Lauda Sion*—of St. Thomas Aquinas crammed with Eucharistic teaching expressed in the lucid, succinct and pregnant Latin of one of the greatest intelligences God has made. For instance:

Dogma datur Christianis
Quod in carnem transit panis,
Et vinum in sanguinem.

Caro cibus, sanguis potus:
Manet tamen Christus totus
Sub utraque specie.

Great saint as Thomas is, he is fully alive to the challenge to our senses these words contain:

Quod non capis, quod non vides,
Animosa firmat fides,
Praeter rerum ordinem.

Fracto demum sacramento,
Ne vacilles, sed memento
Tantum esse sub fragmento
Quantum toto tegitur.

We do believe and with God's help are ready to seal that belief with our blood; but the challenge is great, and our belief is strengthened and refreshed by such words coming from the lips of such a man.

In his *Sacris solemniis,* in Matins for the feast, while stating with uncompromising literalness what Holy Communion means, he departs from his usual impersonal style:

O res mirabilis! manducat Dominum
Pauper servus et humilis.

And what an amount the great theologian has put into the *Lectio V* of the feast: *O Pretiosum* . . . (I would respectfully ask my Reverend reader to open the *Pars aestiva* while he reads this article, as I can only indicate the passages). Is it mere coincidence and not rather the ruling of a loving Providence that the writing of the Office for the feast of that mystery that is closest to our daily life and offers the strongest challenge to our senses should have been entrusted to a saint who was one of the supreme intellects of all time?

But in the Office for *Corpus Christi* and its Octave, we hear other voices besides that of Aquinas. We hear Augustine, Ambrose, Chrysostom, the two Cyrils, Cyprian and Hilary. Great names all that have commanded the respect of Christendom. We hear the voices of men who lived long centuries nearer than we are to Christ's own day and to that Last Supper when it all began. We hear these great and holy men trumpeting in unmistakable words, at times in glowing eloquence—much of what we read was preached—all the wonders of the Eucharist. It stirs us to read them even in the cold printed page. Unfortunately, these *Lectiones* for *Corpus Christi* and its Octave may have received scant attention, as they were hurriedly fitted into a busy clerical day. It was a duty to read them. To re-read them leisurely from time to time will be a tonic for our faith and our Eucharistic and priestly life. And that *Pars aestiva* is so handy and always at hand. It does not repel us as would perhaps learned and unwieldy tomes. A thousand pities it would be to look on this reading only as an annual fulfilment of an obligation.

What we often see we seldom look at. What we often hear we seldom listen to. And there is a difference between seeing and looking, between hearing and listening. The great physical phenomena about us—the sun and stars, for instance—seldom draw our looks. Is there not a danger of a similar reaction to spiritual phenomena? And what spiritual phenomenon is comparable to the Eucharist?

Take the morning miracle of our Mass. We know Augustine's words: "O veneranda sacerdotum dignitas, in quorum manibus Dei filius, velut in utero Virginis incarnatur." They are arresting, they are bold, but how true! When we reflect on what happens at the Consecration and on all we have to do with it, it overwhelms,

it almost terrifies. At Cana water was changed into wine, and we wonder at it. Now wine is changed into blood and into the Blood of Christ. And we are instrumental in the changing. The words of Ambrose: *Ergo sermo . . .* (*Lectio* V of the 4th day of the Octave) are uncompromising. And Christ uses our lips to utter the words that work this wonder—not one whit less stupendous for being a daily wonder. And when these words have passed our lips, there He lies—the living glorified Christ, the historic divine Person of the Gospel. We touch Him, we move Him at will. It is all an unfathomable mystery, but, though unfathomable, we can keep getting deeper and deeper into the realising of it.

Alas for human nature! Even at the altar routine may do its deadly work. Yet surely there are ways of anchoring our drifting thoughts and keeping them from being swept away by all sorts of irrelevancies. Did we but pay strict attention to the smallest rubrics, for instance, it would be helpful. Did we but recall all our Mass means for God, for the Church, for ourselves, it should help to bring our vagrant mind to attention and fix it on the mighty things we are accomplishing.

Again, it would be useful to try to follow, as best we may, the meaning of all we read and say in the Gloria, Collect, Epistle and Gospel, Offertory; in the Canon with its cortège of venerable prayers—to say nothing of the Prayer of prayers, the *Pater noster* —stretching back so far into early Christianity and so fraught with meaning. All this may mean a few moments more at Mass. But they will be negligibly few and eventually our congregation will forgive us. We can all recall the memories of our First Mass. Yet all that happened then happens daily now, were we Golden Jubilarians in the priesthood. It is we who have changed, not Christ, not the Mass. May there not be a sad application to ourselves at times in the words Jesus addressed to Philip: "Have I been so long a time with you and have you not known me?" (*John* 14:9). In trying to bring home to ourselves the reality of Christ's closeness to us at the altar, we are not trying to work up emotional fancies, but waking up to bewildering though none the less theological truths.

Near as we priests get to Christ at the altar during Mass, we get still nearer—in common with all the Faithful—when we com-

municate. Here, too, it would be well to recall the theology of Holy Communion. Of course we cannot better the words of Christ Himself. They are crystal clear. But they can be forgotten. We can hear without listening. "My flesh is meat indeed: and my blood is drink indeed. . . he that eateth me, the same also shall live by me" (*John* 6: 56-58). In most of the Postcommunion prayers we are reminded of what Communion does. To take random instances, it rids us of our perverse inclinations; by it we are refreshed and cleansed from all our faults; it is nourishment for our souls and (mark the words) sustenance for our bodies; it fosters the ardour of divine love; it is the food of immortality.

St. Thomas is again to the fore. It would profit to read *Lectio* VI for the feast: *Nullum etiam sacramentum. . . .* St. Chrysostom is ever eloquent on the subject. There is nothing vague in his words about the reality of the reception of Christ in Communion: *Vellem ipsius formam aspicere . . .* (*Lectio* IV for Sunday within the Octave). And how glowing are his words on the dispositions that should be ours in *Lectio* V and VI of the same Sunday! And we know the picture he has drawn of communicants: *Tamquam leones,* in *Lectio* V of the Saturday within the Octave. And in bold language St. Cyril of Jerusalem speaks of us after the reception of the Eucharist as *concorporei, ut ita dicam, et consanguinei Christi facti* (*Lectio* IV for the Octave).

If we keep Christ's essential idea of food before us, how full of practical suggestion it is! It can, alas! remind us of undesirable possibilities. We have a familiar expression "to bolt our food," to swallow it hastily, without masticating it. We know what it implies. Its application to our daily thanksgiving is too obvious to stress. The resultant losses are sadly plain. To obviate them, would it not be well—however long or short be the time we spend after Mass—to adopt some little plan or method that will ensure that none of it go to waste?

But the Eucharistic relationship of the priest with Christ does not end with his Mass and Communion. Most of us priests have Christ as a close companion throughout the day and night. Most of us are living a stone's throw from Him. Many of us under the same material roof. Others drop in for a few moments and then leave. In a sense we stay on. We may get used to staying

on. We reside with Christ. His house is ours. We are free of the sanctuary and tread it with the calm and assurance of a proprietor. Familiarity may breed forgetfulness. As we enter that Presence and move about in it, we may get used to it. When we kneel before the tabernacle, it may help to recall a favourite Gospel scene or parable and then to remind ourselves that the Christ who figured in that scene, who spoke that parable, is really, personally but a few feet from us.

Do we exploit this closeness of Christ to us? We are His ministers, His fellow-priests. Our interests are His. Why not take Him more into our confidence in all that concerns our priestly work? Obviously He knows all our problems. And perhaps this very fact makes us think it superfluous to share them with Him. But He understands them as no one can, even when we cannot formulate them ourselves. A few moments before the tabernacle may light up the darkness and straighten out the tangled skein, we know how saintly priests were devoted to the Real Presence. Yet its objective reality is the same for all.

As we said, we priests may at times be lonely. If so, we are in good company. Have we ever, on entering a church, been suddenly almost startled on finding it empty of all living presences save the One? We close the door on the roaring, swirling tide of humanity and find Him alone. We wake up to that aloneness. It must make us think. It should help to bring Christ and us nearer to one another.

What lies at the root of all these Eucharistic wonders? Love. There is a little sentence in St. John's Gospel (11:5) that is very delightful: "Now Jesus loved Martha and her sister Mary and Lazarus." These are the words of Him who died for the love of *all*. Yet Jesus uses language here we all use when we refer to special friends. There was a special corner in the Sacred Heart for these three friends. This opens up a field for thought. If there are any individuals in the world who should qualify for such particular friendship on the part of Christ, they should be, one would think, his own priests. We are instrumental in giving Him His Eucharistic existence. We are the guardians of that existence, the caretakers of His earthly dwelling, His intimates and confidants.

This particular personal friendship with our Eucharistic Lord can be cultivated. It can grow in closeness and intimacy. Our faith can grow in vividness. The fervour of our daily Mass and of our daily thanksgiving can grow in intensity. Our dwelling with Christ can grow daily richer in fruit. The Eucharist will thus gradually invest our life and go far towards counteracting the loneliness more or less incidental to our priesthood and filling up the vacuum in our heart.

JOHN CARR, C.SS.R.

College of St. Alphonsus
Limerick, Ireland

MORALITY IN POLITICAL CAMPAIGNING

Periodically, and especially in presidential election years, attention is focused on the need of "clean political campaigns." This is not an impossible achievement. Whatever abuses exist can be eliminated by a firm adherence to the law of God and by an exercise of the principles of right reason.

Over the years the American hierarchy has warned that politics must not be divorced from morality. Their joint Pastoral Letter of 1919 called to the country's attention the true meaning and purpose of politics. "In its primary meaning politics has for its aim the administration of government in accordance with the express will of the people and for their best interests. This can be accomplished by the adoption of right principles, the choice of worthy candidates for office, the direction of partisan efforts towards the nation's true welfare and the purity of election, but not by dishonesty. The idea that politics is exempt from the requirements of morality is both false and pernicious; it is practically equivalent to the notion that in government there is neither right nor wrong, and that the will of the people is simply an instrument to be used for private advantage." In November 1951 the Bishops stated: "In politics the principle that 'anything goes' simply because people are thought not to expect any high degree of honor in politicians is grossly wrong. We have to recover that sense of personal obligation on the part of the voter and that sense of public trust on the part of the elected official which give meaning and dignity to political life. Those who are selected for office by their fellowmen are entrusted with grave responsibilities. They have been selected not for self-enrichment but for conscientious public service. In their speech and in their actions they are bound by the same laws of justice and charity which bind private individuals in every other sphere of human activity. Dishonesty, slander, detraction, and defamation of character are as truly transgressions of God's commandments when resorted to by men in political life as they are for all other men."

This morality which should govern the whole exercise of politics must also regulate the conduct of the political campaign. It justly limits but does not eliminate criticism, which under the American system has always been recognized as the right and even the duty

of the opposing parties. In the early years of the last century Archbishop Kenrick wrote: "All office-holders, even the President himself, according to the Constitution whereby we are ruled, are in a certain sense subject to public opinion. Therefore he does not sin who out of zeal for the State investigates their deeds and rightly condemns them; but he who rashly makes known the hidden faults of their past life, or the crimes of their relatives, or any other thing of this sort, which is of no advantage to the public welfare, sins against them by detraction."

Thus the previous public service of any man who aspires to office, the foreign and domestic policies of the party he represents are legitimate subjects of criticism. In a free society there are divergent views. The more fully these differences of opinion are debated the better informed the voter can be. Likewise the hidden faults or crimes of one's opponent may be revealed if these would interfere with the proper exercise of office. An example would be the case of a man aspiring to public service who had secretly been guilty of either accepting or giving bribes. In such situations the welfare of all prevails over the right of the individual to maintain his reputation. One may also openly discuss any real defect of an opponent, which though not disqualifying him from office makes him less fit for it than one's self. When a candidate proposes himself to the people, he places his fitness for office in competition with that of his opponent. For this reason it is permissible to point out that the opposing candidate is not as skilled in foreign or domestic affairs, that he is imprudent in action. However, under the American Constitution a man's race or religion does not belong in such a category.

Any such personal criticism must be founded on objective reality. One of the most serious defects in political campaigns is the distortion of truth or even the use of falsehood. This is equivalent to slander or calumny and has no place either in public or in private life.

There have been occasions in American history when the distortion of truth and the use of falsehood have been directly and purposely employed. More frequently, however, truth suffers because reason is beclouded by the passions aroused during a partisan campaign. The following errors against logic are cited as some examples.

To carefully scrutinize the past statements of one's opponent is a valid procedure and a very effective method of swaying the minds of the people. Yet it is contrary to truth to take these things out of context and to so use them that they convey or insinuate a meaning not originally intended.

The political address is often an *argumentum ad populum,* something directed to the feelings, passions, and prejudices of the people rather than to their intelligence. An impassioned and partisan speaker in his zeal for office may lead an audience to infer what was not actually said or to draw conclusions not based on objective evidence.

A form of "Begging the Question" also appears in campaign oratory. It puts forth as true some conclusion about the opposition but gives no proof. For example, one finds expressions such as: "My opponent's party will conduct a dirty campaign." "I must join in the criticism of the mistaken policies of this man." If such statements are to be made, then some substantiation for them should be forthcoming. A policy is not necessarily mistaken because one disagrees with it.

Over-simplification of the issues may also interfere with truth. Thus while any number of other influences may have been operative, full blame for any great civil misfortune is often laid upon the incumbent office-holder and his party.

To injure one's opponent either by revealing unnecessarily a hidden fault or crime or by slander is a violation of God's law. Sometimes the sin is slight, sometimes grave. Among other things the determination of guilt depends on one's intentions, one's awareness of what is being done, and the degree of harm inflicted on the other both as regards his personal reputation and his chances for office. It is not without point to remark that even the dead have a right to a good name. It is contrary to God's law to make known without sufficient reason their hidden faults or to falsely impute crimes to them as a means of discrediting a living candidate, who was their friend.

Any criticism of a candidate by the various media of the news is also to be regulated by the above-mentioned moral principles. Though the remarks of individual voters do not injure to the same degree as statements reaching large audiences, yet in their private discussions of candidates such people should avoid making

unwarranted charges or implications. Even political parties have a right to a good name and may not be unjustly accused.

Apart from criticizing his opponent, the one seeking election must present his own qualifications for office. In this truth must be his guide. The candidate should also avoid making exaggerated campaign promises. If he has no intention of fulfilling them or is reasonably certain that he cannot, he is guilty of deception.

Finally, two further suggestions of the American Bishops, if followed, would help raise the moral tone of politics in general, and at least indirectly exert pressure on political campaigners. The Pastoral Letter of 1919 urges all citizens not to avoid politics because of any failures found therein but to bring about a reform by devoting a reasonable amount of time to the maintenance of good government. "The expression or application of such views accounts for the tendency, on the part of many of our citizens, to hold aloof from politics. But their abstention will not effect the needed reform, nor will it arouse from their apathy the still larger number who are so intent upon their own pursuits that they have no inclination for political duties. Each citizen should devote a reasonable amount of time and energy to the maintenance of right government by the exercise of his political rights and privileges. He should understand the issues that are brought before the people, and cooperate with his fellow citizens in securing, by all legitimate means, the wisest possible solution." A reasoned and conscientious use of the ballot also contributes towards the elimination of abuses in politics. In 1840 the Bishops reminded the voter that he was responsible not only to society but also to God for the correct use of his franchise. "Reflect that you are accountable not only to society but to God, for the honest, independent, and fearless exercise of your own franchise, that it is a trust confided to you not for your private gain but for the public good, and that if yielding to any undue influence you act either through favor, affection, or the motives of dishonest gain against your own deliberate view of what will promote your country's good, you have violated your trust, you have betrayed your conscience, and you are a renegade to your country. Do then, we entreat of you, avoid the contaminating influence of political life, keep yourselves aloof from the pestilential atmosphere in which honor, virtue, patriotism, and religion perish; and be assured that our republic can never be

respected abroad, nor sustained at home, save by an uncompromising adherence to honor, to virtue, to patriotism, and to religion."

EDWARD J. CARNEY, O.S.F.S.

De Sales Hall
Hyattsville, Md.

LITURGICAL AND PRIVATE PRAYER

Romano Guardini once said: "A parish which does not give the Liturgy the place it deserves, and lives only from popular devotions, treating liturgical things, above all the Mass, after the manner of a popular devotion, must needs become religiously anemic."[1] How greatly the religious situation of the last century suffered from such spiritual poverty was recently well demonstrated by Anton Mayer in a long article which appeared in 1953 in *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft*.[2]

It was a century in which, partially because of an understandable reaction to the Enlightenment and partially because of a certain assimilation of the spirit of the times, the rich doctrinal and educational role of thought was sternly relegated to the background, not only in art, literature and poetry, but also in the realm of piety. In its place appeared an often excessive emphasis on feeling and sentiment. And this expressed itself in the introduction and concern for those forms of worship, feasts and prayer-types which best suited such a tendency.[3] The community was lost sight of; the individual was far too concerned with himself alone.[4] Liturgical actions which were originally meant to be the prayer and action of a community, of the *plebs sancta,* became mere occasions or settings for cultivation of one's individual spiritual life through moral and ascetical practices which had little or no relation to the liturgical action.[5]

In the sphere of eucharistic piety many no longer saw the central role of Sacrifice and Communion. They rather laid the emphasis on adoration. Popular forms of eucharistic devotion vied with the Mass and Communion in rank of importance, and for many Benediction, Exposition, and the Procession took the place of assistance at Mass and reception of Holy Communion. It is not at all strange to find spiritual writers treat the Mass as one of the ways to

[1] *Volksliturgie und Seelsorge* (Kolmar im Elsass, 1942): "Der Gesamtzusammenhang des christlichen Gebetslebens," p. 23.

[2] "Die Stellung der Liturgie von der Zeit der Romantik bis zur Jahrhundertwende," pp. 1-77.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 48.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 55.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 58.

worship Christ in the Sacrament.[6] Due to many contributing factors, such as concert-type polyphony, the Mass came to be regarded more and more as a purely priestly affair, during which the people could go their own way, busy with their own private meditations and exercises. The famous and influential prayer book of Heinrich Bone published in 1846 offered the faithful for the assistance at Mass prayers and hymns, which, according to the author's own words, do not follow the parts of the Mass, but rather constitute a devotion quite distinct and independent.[7] As for Communion, during the entire nineteenth century, yes even deep into the twenties of our own century, it was quite rare to find Holy Communion distributed at its proper liturgical place *during* Mass; it was more and more regarded, not as the Sacrificial Meal, but as a private devotion. A further example of the individualistic and purely subjective outlook on the Mass so current is Martin von Cochem, who in his *Explanation of the Mass*[8] offers us a series of allegorical interpretations of the Mass which can lay claim to no higher authority than Martin himself: they are a pure projection of his own lively imagination.

Little wonder, then, if the Liturgy in the nineteenth century could still barely radiate its forming power which once molded the spiritual life of entire generations. The result was often enough an individualistic as well as sentimental piety. When the Liturgy itself was handled in such an arbitrary manner, it was not too difficult a step to divorce one's life completely from it. People felt no scruple in patterning their spiritual lives as closely as possible to the personal religious experience of a few souls, be they canonized saints, mystics, spiritual writers, or composers of devotional prayerbooks. But they paid little attention to the spiritual life of the supernatural organism of which they were members. What happened? "The history of mysticism, in so far as it developed apart from the Liturgy, is full of oddities. For the prayer of the individual is always in danger of losing the theocentric and of becoming the projection of his own notions and desires."[9] Without a conscious tie with the universal values of the Church's

[6] Jungman, *Missarum Sollemnia,* I (New York, 1951), 150.

[7] Anton Mayer, p. 60.

[8] (New York, 1896). See especially Ch. VI.

[9] A. Kirchgässner, "Liturgische und private Frömmigkeit," *Geist und Leben,* XXV (1952), 190.

prayer, the prayer of individuals and groups inevitably became the prey of sentimentalism and isolationism. The result could not possibly be other than an unhealthy, unbalanced, if not downright uncatholic spiritual life.

Tension was bound to mount when at the turn of the century the Liturgical Movement undertook to call the faithful back to the primary and indispensable source of the true Christian spirit. The devotees of the "traditional" piety took offense at this alleged innovation, and a heated controversy ensued concerning the relationship between liturgical and private piety—a controversy which reached all the way into the 1940's. The counterattack launched against the Liturgical Movement showed how deep-set the malady of religious individualism really was and how mistaken its premises.

The French Jesuit Jean Navatel, for example, in 1913, excluded from the Liturgy all sanctifying power and relegated it to a mere occasional and rare influence on the spiritual life precisely because, as he said, the Liturgy is but the purely sensible, ceremonial and decorative part of Catholic worship.[10] In Germany the attacks against the Liturgical Movement culminated in the books of Kassiepe and Doerner. The former realized that he had unwittingly condemned a lot of good with the extremism of a few individuals and published another edition in which he softened his remarks.[11] The latter, however, August Doerner, was fanatical in his opposition and even published and circulated his book *Sentire Cum Ecclesia* despite the fact that the Vicar General of the diocese of Trier, of which he was a priest, refused him the Imprimatur. He declared expressly: "The entire interior and non-official sphere of religion has no relation to the Liturgy."[12] And Archbishop Konrad Gröber of Freiburg wrote in 1942: "A parish which lives only from popular devotions need not necessarily become religiously anemic."[13]

When in 1947 the great Liturgy Encyclical of Pius XII appeared, the superficial reader may have gained the impression that the controversy regarding the relationship between liturgical and

[10] "L'apostolat liturgique et la piété personnelle," *Etudes,* CXXXVII (1913), 452.

[11] *Irrwege und Umwege im Frömmigkeitsleben der Gegenwart* (1st edit. Kevelaer, 1939; 2nd edit. Würzburg, 1940).

[12] *Sentire cum Ecclesia* (Kühlen/Gladbach, 1941), p. 255.

[13] "Memorandum," *La Maison-Dieu,* VII (1946), 103.

private piety was decided in favor of private piety. Many hasty writers were content to quote only those words of the Encyclical which rebuked the liturgical extremists. They interpreted the Pope as though he held Liturgy and private piety to be two distinct and completely independent ways, between which a person could choose according to his personal inclination. A careful study, however, of the pertinent parts of the Encyclical will show that the Pope in reality embraces an entirely different opinion.

Before we examine his teaching, let us clarify two preliminary questions. First, what does the Encyclical mean by Liturgy? In the various definitions which it offers, it emphasizes repeatedly that the Liturgy has a priestly and sacramental character and that this characteristic of the Liturgy in the strict sense is found only in the Mass, the Sacraments, the Divine Office and the Sacramentals. "The sacred liturgy is, consequently, the public worship which our Redeemer as Head of the Church renders to the Father, as well as the worship which the community of the faithful renders to its Founder, and through Him to the heavenly Father. It is, in short, the worship rendered by the Mystical Body of Christ in the entirety of its Head and members."[14] ". . . the liturgy is nothing more nor less than the exercise of this [Christ's] priestly function."[15] "Such is the nature and object of the sacred liturgy: to it belong the Mass, the sacraments, the divine office."[16] And earlier in the Encyclical, the sacramentals are specifically included.[17] Popular devotions, therefore, are not Liturgy in this sense, since there is no sacramental mediation of grace in them, nor can they be considered actions and prayers of Christ. The Pope does say later on in the Encyclical that they are Liturgy in a *broad* sense, because they may be considered in a certain way to be an addition to the liturgical cult, they have been approved and praised over and over again by the Apostolic See,[18] they make us partakers in a salutary manner of the liturgical cult, because they urge the faithful to go frequently to the Sacrament of Penance, to attend Mass and receive Communion with devotion, and, as well, encourage them to meditate on the mysteries of our redemption and imitate the example of the saints.[19] They are, therefore, not Lit-

[14] *Mediator Dei*, par. 20 (America Press Edition).
[15] *Ibid.*, 22.
[16] *Ibid.*, 171.
[17] *Ibid.*, 27.
[18] *Ibid.*, 182.
[19] *Ibid.*, 183.

urgy, but something which may be considered as added to the Liturgy proper. As for what regards our problem, they will always be referred to as private prayer along with all those exercises of piety which we perform in private.

Secondly, we must bear in mind that the logical opposition in this question is not between liturgical and *personal* prayer, but between liturgical and *private* prayer. The Liturgy cannot be rightly called prayer at all, if it does not proceed from the interior devotion of the individual. Guardini says: "Only when the individual really prays as an individual can the great prayer of the Church achieve that spontaneity and genuinity which are proper to it."[20] The Pope expressly objects to a false conception of the Liturgy which would make of it an impersonal and formalistic ceremony. The emphasis in worship lies on the interior assent: "the chief element of divine worship must be interior."[21]

What then does the Encyclical say concerning the relationship between liturgical and private prayer? First it lays down as a basic principle that between the realms of liturgical and private prayer *in themselves* there can be no opposition or conflict.[22] Not only that, but a whole series of forms of private devotion receive explicit mention and recommendation: "It is our wish also that the faithful, as well, should take part in these practices. The chief of these are: meditation on spiritual things, diligent examination of conscience, closed retreats, visits to the blessed sacrament, and those special prayers in honor of the Blessed Virgin Mary among which the rosary, as all know, has pride of place."[23] "Among these are the prayers usually said during the month of May in honor of the Blessed Virgin Mother of God, or during the month of June to the most Sacred Heart of Jesus; also novenas, and triduums, stations of the cross and other similar practices."[24] But the Encyclical also states that there is no real opposition between the liturgy and religious exercises "provided that they be kept within legitimate bounds and performed for a legitimate purpose."[25] Hence this recommendation accorded certain exercises has no absolute character. Not only does the Encyclical understandably withdraw its support from those forms of religious devotion which are theologically unsound, it furthermore sees the possibility that

[20] *Op. cit.*, p. 23.
[21] *Mediator Dei*, 24.
[22] *Ibid.*, 36, 37.
[23] *Ibid.*, 174.
[24] *Ibid.*, 182.
[25] *Ibid.*, 173.

even those forms which are approved by it are out of place in certain circumstances, and therefore are to be disapproved in concrete cases.

To enable us to make a clear judgment in this question, the Encyclical gives us negative as well as positive norms for private prayer. These norms are formulated in accordance, not with the inner laws and exigencies of private prayer, but with those of liturgical prayer. Forms of private prayer are to be condemned, says the Encyclical, if "they are an obstacle to the *principles and norms of divine worship,* or if they hinder them or oppose them,"[26] or if, because of them, the faithful "were to neglect the august sacrifice of the altar and the sacraments," and allow themselves to be "withdrawn from the stream of vital energy that flows from Head to members."[27] In such a case "one must surely conclude that they are not in keeping with prudence and enlightened zeal."[28] Naturally this need not always be the fault of popular forms of piety themselves; often it is nothing more than a case of not being used at the right time or in the right place.

But a negative principle is hardly sufficient to express fully a relationship so important as that between the inner prayer-life of the Church and that of the individual soul. The Pope also sees in the Liturgy the *positive* norm to which the private prayer of the faithful must measure up. Private prayer has a common goal together with the Liturgy: that Christ be formed in us.[29] Hence the Encyclical explicitly states that only those exercises of piety are to be considered wholesome which lead us to the Liturgy. "The criterion of this will be the effectiveness of these exercises in making the divine cult loved and spread daily ever more widely, and in making the faithful approach the sacraments with more longing desire, and in obtaining for all things holy due respect and honor."[30] The Pope tells us how exercises of private piety are to do this when, in a sentence which is one of the most important of the whole Encyclical, he requires that they be permeated with the same spirit as the Liturgy. "However, it is necessary that the spirit of the sacred liturgy and its directives should exercise such a salutary influence on them that nothing improper be introduced nor anything unworthy of the dignity of the house of God or detrimental to the sacred functions or opposed to solid piety."[31]

[26] *Ibid.*, 181.
[27] *Ibid.*, 32.
[28] *Ibid.*, 181.
[29] *Ibid.*, 37.
[30] *Ibid.*, 181.
[31] *Ibid.*, 184.

Hence to the rites and prayers of the sacred Liturgy goes pride of place. Nothing must be permitted to interfere with them or create dispositions in the souls of the faithful that will lead them away from their sanctifying and formative influence. And furthermore all prayer must look to the Liturgy as to its teacher and follow its lead, not as to its minute methods and prescriptions, but, what is far more important, in assimilating its theological content and the manner in which that content finds expression. That is what is meant by the spirit of the Liturgy.

We can understand even better the concern of the Pope in this question and the importance of its correct resolution for the spiritual life of the Church from a letter which Archbishop Montini, at that time Pro-Secretary of State, addressed to the "Centro Pastorale Liturgico" of Italy during the Marian Year. There we read:

> It cannot be repeated often enough what precious treasures in the Church would be opened to each individual as well as to all, if the powerful stream of love for Mary, which affords the brightest note of hope for our troubled days, were informed and regulated by the spirit of the Liturgy. For then our relationship to Mary would not limit itself to superficial sentiment or to an anxious and self-interested plea for help in the hour of need, but rather would gain those qualities of maturity and depth on which depend the constancy and fruitfulness of the spiritual life.

As we can see, the question of the relationship between liturgical and private piety has found in the Encyclical *Mediator Dei* an essentially different answer than the one arrived at by individualistic approach to piety. The Liturgy is the decisive norm for extra-liturgical prayer, for private prayer, therefore, as well as for popular devotions. These have indeed their irreplaceable significance and value for the spiritual life of a true Christian, for in them is prolonged and carried to fruition what is begun in divine worship: our transformation in Christ. This task they can fulfill only insofar as they make us ripe for the Liturgy in which our life of grace finds its source and continually renewed nourishment.

JOHN H. MILLER, C.S.C.

Holy Cross College
Washington, D. C.

CHRISTIAN HUMANISM AND THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST

The humanist, whether he be a Christian or an atheist, is primarily a seeker after joy. It is his ambition to realize the happiness of completion—that delight which springs from the sense of fulfillment, the knowledge of achieved perfection, which follows upon the actuation of all the potencies of our nature. His dedication to the principle that man as man must be developed fully in all his faculties to the uttermost degree of excellence of each one is simply the practical expression of his search after and his need of joy. He sees and understands that for him, and for all men, life must consist in a gradual unfolding of the beauty within him, like a blossom opening to full flower, and that in the moment of his complete perfection, he will find ultimate happiness.

The humanist, then, be he Christian or atheist, must be primarily a student of human nature. But it is not enough that he study human nature in the masterpieces of world literature and art, which are man's great tribute to himself, and in which are enshrined the most vivid pictures of the greatness and weakness of mankind. This is something, to be sure—something very important and even absolutely necessary as a means to the realization of the humanist ideal. But it is not enough. And it has too often been the error —and the eventual frustration—of the non-Christian humanist that he, precisely, has tried to make it enough, has tried to convince himself that he can see human nature, what it is, in all its fullness and all its potencies, in literature and art alone, and that he need seek no farther for truth and for joy. The Christian knows that he must seek farther. And, as in all things, he finds that his search finally brings him to Christ.

Possibly the most vivid presentation of Christ in the whole annals of Christian thought, outside of the Gospels, is the brief meditation on "The Kingdom of Christ" in *The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius*. The integration of the call of Christ the King with the presentation in the First Week of the *Exercises* of the philosophical and theological foundation of man's destiny, and the precise nature of His call have been discussed and controverted in many places. Nevertheless, I have never seen these meditations

approached from just the point of view of the humanist, and it seems to me that such an approach might be attempted with both interest and profit.

Let it be said, then, that in humanistic terms we can express the "Principle and Foundation" in the proposition, "God created man for joy." God is Joy. His Being, that absolute and utterly actuated existence which is His and His alone, is joy. And His act of creation, His dowering of me with being, is a gift of His joy. But the fact that I am a creature, the fact that my being is limited and, somehow, is bound by non-being, is a limiting of my joy. My need of completion, my hunger for fulfillment in Him is a need of joy. So, my praise and service of Him and the salvation of my soul are a fruition in me of joy. And sin is unhappiness precisely because it hinders my completion in Him, limits my joy, pushes me somehow deeper into the negation of being. Sin is essentially anti-humanistic. The right use of creatures, then, the humanistic use of creatures, is an ever-growing realization of joy, growth in being, filling up of the capacities of my nature. If it is grounded on the "Principle and Foundation," my whole life becomes a progressive unfolding of joy. That is why a trifle is so tremendous, why my use of creatures must be always right. It is the difference between having joy and advancing in humanity, or being only my limited self and having frustration.

Now, the fulfillment in me of all my human capacities through grace, the unfolding in me of the fullness of my being by my completion in God, is what constitutes the Kingdom of Christ. Christ is God in creation. As the Eternal Word is the all-perfect and co-existent expression of God's perfection to Himself, so Christ is the complete and perfect expression of God in material creation, in a human nature. Christ is the humanist ideal personified. In Him, the fullness of being is realized to the utmost human degree. He is man-God: this is what constitutes the inexhaustible riches of Christ. My being completed is, then, a becoming of Christ. My human perfection, which is an unfolding of joy, is an unfolding of Him. The Principle and Foundation of my life is that I must follow Christ completely, expressing God, as He did, in my nature.

This means, then, developing my *whole* nature, just as it is. It does not suffice to develop only my intellect and will, as if I were an angel. It does not suffice to set out to realize some artistic or literary ideal that leaves no room for my religious development, as

if I were only a mass of emotions or an incarnate creative urge. No, I must follow God's law; I must serve Him. Which means that I do His Will. True humanism, Christian humanism, shows me that this means the development of my human nature, harmoniously, according to a properly integrated hierarchy, giving to each faculty that which belongs to it, allowing none to encroach upon the rights of any other. This is fulfillment in God. This is the secret of joy. This is the following of Christ.

For what is Christ's call, really, but the practical, everyday invitation to let Him and His joy unfold in me daily, and to bring it to blossom in others? "My will is to conquer the whole world and all enemies, and thus to enter into the glory of my Father." What is this glory of His Father but the expression of His own perfections in the human nature of His creature man? This demands pain before glory, because it first of all demands that I remove all hindrances to His growth in me (He showed me how much pain is needed to conquer sin!), and, then, bring all His joy to flower. His call is to the perfection of my nature, not for itself, but for Him. His Kingdom is the human expression of God. His call is to Christian humanism.

The significance of this understanding of "The Kingdom of Christ," of its relation to "The Principle and Foundation" of life, and of its perfect response to the demands of the humanistic ideal, cannot be over-estimated for those who are dedicated to the perfection of themselves and of others.

As priests, we learn from it the necessity of the development of the human nature of the souls we strive to bring to grace. As scholars, we come to perceive the true meaning of our studies and the true importance of our advancement in learning. As lovers of art and literature, we are taught that all great ideas, all manifestations of human beauty, have God's plan as their source and their ultimate value. As teachers, we understand that our efforts to educate, to bring about in our pupils the full development of their mental, physical, and spiritual potencies is far more than mere education. It is a God-making. It is the practical response to the call of Our King to help in the spreading of His Kingdom.

JOHN CARROLL FUTRELL, S.J.

St. Mary's College
St. Marys, Kansas

Answers to Questions

BROADMINDEDNESS OR INDIFFERENTISM?

Question: In the June issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* you asserted that the members of a Catholic fraternal organization did wrong in offering their hall to a Protestant congregation for Sunday services, when these people had lost their church by fire. However, could this not have been permitted on the score that it is allowed to invite a person to do the less evil of two actions? Surely, it is a lesser evil to practice some religious rites, even though they contain heresy, than to practice no religion at all.

Answer: The principle to which our questioner refers—that at times it is permissible to persuade a person to perform the less evil of two courses of action—can sometimes be utilized (I believe) by a Catholic to persuade a non-Catholic to perform some acts of his particular form of worship. Thus, in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for June, 1945, I expressed the opinion that Catholics, promoting the "released-time program" in a large city, may lawfully urge non-Catholic parents to send their children for religious instruction to their particular church on the ground that otherwise many of these children would be brought up utterly devoid of all religious knowledge and practice. In the case of such children, religious instruction and inspiration containing some error is better than no religion at all.

But the present case is entirely different. There is no question of persons who will never have any religion in their lives at all if they do not have services next Sunday. They are the kind of people who will probably pray at home, whether they have church services or not; and in a few weeks, at the most, they will find accommodations for their public worship. And so, the opinion that they can be urged or helped toward conducting their services on the principle of suggesting the lesser of two evils is based on an entire misconception of what this principle means.

Some additional circumstances narrated to me by the priest who submitted the original case may be interesting to our readers. He was told about the matter by a member of the fraternal organization, who added: "We were lucky enough to get our offer to the minister several hours before another Protestant congregation offered the use of their hall, and the people who lost their church are going to use our hall." He was proud and happy that it was a Catholic organization that was first to give this mark of "brotherhood and broadmindedness." Perhaps he would even have regarded it as a compliment to be told that he was getting away from outmoded Catholic notions, and was almost as decent a fellow as a Protestant! At any event, the Bishop of the diocese intervened and forbade the Catholic organization to go through with their plans.

The news magazine *Time* in its issue of July 9 carried excerpts from my article. The result was a number of letters, both from Catholics and from non-Catholics, some sent to me, some sent to *Time* (July 30). None of them expressed approval of my statements. Some called for further explanation, some were vehement in their denunciation of my "narrowmindedness" and "bigotry." One writer proposed as an argument that all churches are good the fact that Our Lord preached in several synagogues! The charge that I am "un-American" was predominant. It seemed to have been taken for granted that my decision was a personal view, although actually I merely expressed the common teaching of Catholic theologians.

I am not disturbed by the abuse and vituperation that were directed against me personally. In the course of years I have become accustomed to this type of argumentation. Nor am I surprised that American non-Catholics should oppose the opinions I expressed on this occasion, because nowadays among most Protestants of our nation the predominant opinion is that all religions are good, that we ought to forget our credal differences, that we should all help one another to practice our various types of worship, etc. It can truly be said that the most prevalent and most widely applied religious principle among the non-Catholics of our land today is that it doesn't make much difference what religion you profess and practice, as long as you profess and practice some religion.

But the alarming fact is that this idea is being widely accepted by Catholics. *Time* was correct in stating that my solution to the problem in question would come as a surprise to some Catholics. It is not difficult to find reasons for this attitude. The main reason is that our people hear the principle of indifferentism proclaimed so frequently and so fervently. Day after day they hear and read such statements as: "It's deeds, not creeds, that count. . . . We are all going to heaven by different roads. . . . Your religion is as good as mine, etc." It is only natural that some Catholics should begin to accept these assertions as self-evident truths, uttered with such conviction, and with the implication that if you do not believe them you are a fool or a wicked person.

But another reason for this situation, I believe, is the fact that some priests are not sufficiently alert to the situation, and consequently are not giving our people sufficient instruction and guidance. We must, in the first place, be most consistent with the teachings of our Church in our own conduct, mindful that we too are subject to the influences that surround us. In our dealings with our non-Catholic fellow citizens we should draw an exact line between the charity and justice that we must manifest to these men and women personally and the forms of cooperation and communication that we may not give to their religious activities. Whatever may be their creed, they have a right to our Christian charity and good will. As citizens of the United States they have the same civil rights as we have to their religious worship, and any attempt on our part to limit these rights would be a violation of the constitutional principle of full religious equality that is a reasonable feature of our American life. For example, to refuse to vote for the most competent candidate for office merely because he is a non-Catholic would be an unjustifiable act of bigotry. In efforts toward civic betterment, priests should co-operate wholeheartedly with non-Catholic clergymen. We can appreciate the personal qualities of these men, some of whom offer an inspiration to priests by their zeal and self-sacrifice. But that does not make their religion true, nor give us any right to transgress the rules of the Church and Catholic theology in the matter of cooperation toward their religious activities.

In addition, we must instruct our people thoroughly and clearly on this matter. The point at issue is one that any intelligent Catholic

should understand without difficulty. Jesus Christ, the Son of God, founded only one religion, which He committed to His Church, the Catholic Church, commanding that all men accept it. Hence, religious activities contrary to those prescribed by the Catholic Church are not in accord with the will of God, and Catholics may not encourage or promote them. Any member of the Church who will not admit this fundamental doctrine is not a Catholic in the proper sense of the word.

Strange to say, in modern America people will denounce a person who will abandon his convictions in order to promote "good will" when other phases of human activity are involved, but will praise him for acting in this manner in the sphere of religion. If Doctor A is convinced that a surgical process which Doctor B is planning to employ on a patient would be seriously harmful to the sick person, he will not accept Dr. B's invitation to participate in the operation "in order to eliminate differences of opinion among doctors." If he did accept, he surely would not be praised for his "fine broadmindedness," but might be debarred from the medical profession if the case became public. If Congressman A is convinced that a certain proposed measure would be harmful to the country, but voted for it at the request of Congressman B in "order to promote good will among congressmen," he would justly be condemned as a most disloyal public servant. But if a Catholic refuses to praise and to aid religious activities which he is convinced are opposed to the plan of God, when he is asked to do this "in order to foster amity among men of good will," he is denounced as a bigot and—loudest of all—he is said to be "un-American."

There is a certain measure of humor in this last charge, which can be perceived only by one who has some knowledge of the policies of non-Catholics in early America. The story now circulated—and believed, I suppose, by the great majority of Americans—is that Protestants have always been the great exponents and defenders of full religious equality in our land. Recently, I received a letter from a Protestant lady who assured me that for 300 years her ancestors have been working to secure religious freedom in America. I wonder if she knows that in pre-Revolutionary days most of the English colonies had severe laws against Catholics, and that for a considerable period after the establishment of

the federal government some of the States imposed civil restrictions on Catholics.

In view of these facts, it seems inconsistent on the part of Protestants to ask us if they would be subject to legal disabilities in the event that Catholics ever secured the majority of votes in the United States. To this question we can answer, truthfully and without hesitation, that there is no Catholic principle that would require any such action on our part in this country, and that as far as all intelligent American Catholics are concerned, such restriction should never take place, no matter how strong we may become. But we are getting tired of answering this question. Why should we not ask the inquirers what guarantee they can give that Catholics would not be restricted in the event that a united Protestant group took over the balance of power in our land? As far as the past record is concerned, they were the religious group that made such restrictions, not Catholics.

Priests should face this situation seriously, with the firm resolution to fulfil their duty of instructing and guiding our Catholic people conscientiously. We must teach them clearly and in detail the correct principles, so that they will avoid the disastrous error of indifferentism. And we must set them an example in our own conduct, based on the principle that there is only one true religion, of which, through God's mercy, we are the defenders and exponents.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

THE *SANATIO IN RADICE* AND UNBORN CHILDREN

Question: When a *sanatio in radice* is sought for the mixed marriage of two people who have passed the child-bearing age, may a priest waive the promise required of the Catholic party that all children to be born will be baptized and reared in the Catholic Faith?

Answer: On first thought one might be tempted to say that such a promise is meaningless and, therefore, unnecessary. On further investigation, however, it seems that one must think differently about the matter even though the parties are already beyond the child-bearing age. Principles governing the exercise of dele-

gated jurisdiction dictate that the delegate must not exceed the limits of the authority delegated to him. The authority of the local ordinary to grant a *sanatio in radice* for a mixed marriage is a delegated authority derived from the Holy Office and may be seen in his Quinquennial Faculties. The Holy Office specifically states the conditions under which this faculty is to be exercised. One of the conditions requires the Catholic party to promise explicitly that he/she will provide according to his/her ability for the Catholic baptism and education of all children to be born of the marriage. The Catholic must also promise to provide, if possible, for the conversion, baptism and Catholic education, of children already born of the marriage. The Holy Office makes no mention in the faculty of any discretionary authority to demand or not to demand this promise. Accordingly, it is difficult to see how a priest can judge that he has a right to waive this promise regarding the baptism of children to be born. This conclusion is particularly evident when one examines the Latin text of the faculty which reads as follows:

4. Sanandi in radice matrimonia . . . dummodo: . . . 2° pars catholica explicite promittat se, pro posse, curaturam esse baptismum et catholicam educationem universae prolis forte nasciturae, et (si casus ferat) etiam conversionem, baptismum, catholicam educationem prolis iam natae.

From the wording of the faculty, and particularly from the word *forte,* it appears that the priest is to obtain an explicit promise from the Catholic party to the effect that children to be born will be baptized and reared in the Catholic Faith. Such a promise, moreover, is not entirely meaningless but is a most useful way to determine the dispositions and worthiness of the Catholic party for so great a favor.

THE PRIMARY END OF MARRIAGE AND THE VALIDITY OF MARRIAGE

Question: Must a person positively will to bear children in order to contract a valid marriage?

Answer: A positive act of the will regarding the intention to procreate is certainly not required for the validity of marriage.

In this matter the requirement for validity is somewhat negative in character, namely, the parties must not intend to exclude children from their marriage. The question is directly concerned with the ends of marriage. The traditional Catholic doctrine on the ends of marriage is summed up in canon 1013 of the Code of Canon Law: "The primary purpose of marriage is the procreation and education of children. The secondary purpose is to furnish mutual aid and a remedy for concupiscence." Declarations of both Popes Pius XI and Pius XII, as well as the Holy Office, have reiterated and underlined the traditional doctrine expressed in the canon.

The question of ends of marriage in canon 1013 refers to the *fines operis,* the goals towards which the social institution of matrimony is directed by its very nature. Primary and secondary are not merely synonyms for *more important* and *less important,* but include a relation of subordination and dependence. Both primary and secondary ends are true ends, giving a twofold ordination to matrimony: one, to something beyond the married partners themselves, the child; the other, to the good of the partners as individuals, helps to their mutual perfection. But these two ends are not disparate, much less opposed to each other, but interrelated. The secondary end is subordinate to the primary and principal end and promotes its more perfect achievement. In other words, the fostering of mutual charity and chastity, the secondary end, redounds to, facilitates, and insures the proper generation and education of children.

A practical corrollary is that these ends are so intertwined that any of them taken individually, as long as there is no positive exclusion of the primary end, provides a valid motive for entering a marital union. In fact the benefits of conjugal love may frequently be the primary consideration in the minds of the spouses when they enter the life-partnership of marriage. Their love is, however, objectively ordained to the achievement of the primary *finis operis,* "the sole cause why God established marriage from the beginning," (Catechism of the Council of Trent), and thus the hierarchy of ends in marriage is maintained. A positive intention to bear children, therefore, is not necessary for a valid marriage as long as there is no positive exclusion of this end.

GIFTS TO A RELIGIOUS FOR A SPECIFIC PURPOSE

Question: What is to be said of the practice of religious receiving gifts of money for specific uses

Answer: Such a practice may momentarily work for the advantage of a particular community but nevertheless it is dangerous to religious observance and should be classified as an abuse. Religious are bound in conscience to observe the common life. Any custom which enables a religious to acquire particular material things through gifts of those outside the community is dangerous. Such a custom will eventually lead to abuses and violations of the spirit of poverty. Certainly the ideal is to remember that whatever the religious acquires is acquired for the community. In turn the lawful needs of the individual religious are to be supplied by the community. If such an ideal be kept in mind and carried into practice, there will be no need for individual religious to solicit particular gifts from friends and relatives.

ROMAEUS W. O'BRIEN, *O.Carm.*

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Analecta

In a special Apostolic letter, dated June 29th, the day after the abortive revolt of the Polish workers against the Russians, the Holy Father encouraged the faithful in Soviet satellite nations to remain loyal to the Church. "The entire Christian family," the Pope wrote in tribute to these persecuted Catholics, "looks with reverential awe at what you bear in silence." Addressed to such valiant Catholic bishops as Cardinal Stepinac, Cardinal Wyszynski of Poland, and Cardinal Mindzenty of Hungary, the letter was occasioned by the 5th centennial of Pope Calixtus III's letter to the bishops of these same nations, in a day when the Turks, rather than Communists, threatened the Church. The Holy Father grieved that a pagan education was enforced on the youth of these unhappy lands. His sorrow was also great at the thought of the apostasy of some Catholics who would water down Catholic doctrine to please their Communist masters. But the main tenor of his message was one of hope and encouragement. He urged the suffering Christians to remember the unfailing promises of the Redeemer, even to the point of being "glorious victims." He outlined wise counsels for his children, pleading with them to remain loyal to ecclesiastical authority, to keep the faith intact, to profess Catholicism fearlessly, and to strive earnestly to keep "the Light of Christ" illumined as an example to all.

On July 6th the Holy Father received the German Chancellor, Konrad Adenauer, in a special forty-minute audience. Besides praising the chancellor's wisdom and the marvelous recovery of Germany since the war, the Pope expressed the hope that the East German problem will soon be peacefully solved. He recalled that Germany's post-war difficulties are not all remedied. In their solution he urged the supremacy of the spiritual over the material and the continued close cooperation of church and state.

In two important messages His Holiness again stressed the value of manfully striving for sanctity in these difficult times. On July 3 he addressed 20,000 Italian members of the Third Order

of St. Francis on the great need the world has for the Franciscan spirit and view of life. He told the tertiaries that the third Order was "a school of integral Christian perfection," a school of the genuine Franciscan spirit, and a school of fearless action for spreading the reign of Christ. The other message was a letter dated July 7th of warm encouragement to those engaged in giving spiritual retreats. Addressed to the "Retreat Movement of Perseverance," a group of professional and laboring laymen organized by the Society of Jesus, the letter urged the spread of the "closed retreat" as a means for laymen to gain the strength to combat evil in the world.

To those who consider canon law as formalistic, burdensome and legalistic, the Holy Father gave an irrefutable answer in his address to the professors and students of the University of Vienna law school on June 6th. Far from being merely the work of men, the Pope said, Church law concerns the very organization of the Church. Canon law is essential because, "Christ founded his Church, not as a formless spiritual movement, but as a strongly organized association." One can easily see the true place of canon law in the pontiff's thinking in his closing words: "Church life and Church law belong together. A symbol of this for you would be that of sainted Pope Pius X. He was the creator of the new Church Code of laws by which he opened the sources and sluices of all sacramental life."

His Holiness continued to receive audiences of many varied professions and for each group he had a word of counsel. On June 28th he spoke to 300 members of a Milan hospital of the value of charity and the Christian spirit in hospital work, a thing that no technical or scientific advances can replace. Reminding his hearers of the presence of Christ in the sick, he asked that the Catholic hospital be "inspired by the customs and actions of the virtue represented by the whole of Christian law: love." He especially emphasized the spiritual care of the sick and dying.

On July 10th, the Pope was happy to receive another group of athletes: this time the coaches and members of the "Athletic" soccer team of Bilboa, Spain. He used this opportunity, as he had done in similar instances in the past, to stress the virtues athletics can teach: persistence, self-sacrifice, humility, charity, and many social virtues as well.

A group of French military students and eighty Spanish teachers were also received by the Pontiff. To the soldiers in an audience on July 9th His Holiness said: "Preserve the traditions of honor and fidelity that are your characteristics." But he urged them above all to be "proud Christians," always careful to do battle against the insidious temptations of life.

In his address of July 9th to a group of teachers from Spain, the Pontiff re-emphasized the Catholic educational concept that education is for the whole man. Education should not separate the man, the Catholic, and the professional; all three must fuse together into one concrete person.

On July 2nd Pope Pius announced that the 100th anniversary of the apparitions of Our Lady at Lourdes will be celebrated in a most fitting manner. He has declared a jubilee year to be observed from February 11, 1958, to February 11, 1959, in honor of this occasion.

Among the other acts of the Pope that deserve mention during this period are these. On June 28th Pius XII in a traditional ceremony at St. Peter's blessed the pallia, small circular bands of white wool given to archbishops as a sign of the fullness of episcopal power. The Pope received Archbishop Oddi in a special audience on July 5th. The Archbishop, apostolic delegate in Palestine, will go to Egypt to enter conferences on the personal status of Catholics as well as to convey the Pope's best wishes to President Gamal Nasser. On July 7th the annual medal commemorating the current year of the pope's reign was cast. The medal depicts the Pope with workers, specifically the Pope as he received the gifts of Catholic workers on the occasion of the proclamation of the Feast of St. Joseph the Worker. Pius XII left for his villa at Castel Gondolfo on July 14th. And, the Pope gave another example of his generosity on July 20th when he authorized a check of $10,000 to help alleviate the sufferings caused by the recent earthquakes in Greece.

ROMAEUS W. O'BRIEN, *O.Carm.*

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Book Reviews

LOGIC. AN INTRODUCTION TO ARISTOTELIAN FORMAL LOGIC. By Kenneth F. Dougherty, S.A. Peekskill, N. Y.: Graymoor Press, 1956. Pp. 158. $2.50.

Father Dougherty, who authored a very useful and comprehensive *Cosmology* which has already undergone two printings, presents us with an equally serviceable textbook of logic. His avowed purpose is to provide a manual of Aristotelian formal logic for beginners taking a course in logic in the American liberal arts college. Since most of the manuals now in use are too extensive to be covered in a one-semester course in college, the author, drawing upon his teaching experience, gears his exposition to overcome this obstacle.

Though basically Aristotelian and Thomistic in its orientation, the manual takes fully into account the more recent developments in the field and uses them skilfully for purpose of clarification. Aside from the classical logic of Aristotle and the commentaries of St. Thomas, the author evaluates symbolic or mathematical logic, logical empiricism, semantics and the logic of the diamat. An excellent feature is the abundance of practical illustrations which make for a better grasp of the abstract principles and general rules. Incidentally, these illustrations are not those which have been handed down from generation to generation but are largely derived from our present-day experience and possess a delightful freshness.

Teacher and student alike will enjoy and profit from another innovation of the author. Exercises are not relegated to the end of chapters but are included immediately after the main expository paragraphs. A suggested reading list and a series of pointed questions at the end of each chapter effectively contribute to the elucidation and deeper grasp of the subject matter.

The reviewer would like to see the subsequent editions of this work contain a brief discussion of the statistical method as a corollary to the chapter on the scholastic method. In our age of statistics and polls,

logic is fundamental in the training of the statistician who, in turn, provides material for illustrating the applications of logic.

In view of its practicality this manual of logic is highly recommended for adoption as a textbook in our liberal arts colleges. Its usefulness, however, is not limited to the classroom for the studious among the general public will also find it helpful in reviewing a science which is indispensable in our daily lives.

MAURICE J. GRAJEWSKI, O.F.M.

TALES OF THE LONG BOW. By G. K. Chesterton. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956. Pp. 219. $3.00.

In an age in which the problems of conformity have elicited both solemn discourse and frenetic outcry in the socio-political order, it is something of a relief to welcome the return of a charming group of non-conformists, whose arrival on the contemporary scene will prove a threat only to the composure of the unimaginative.

Admittedly this enthusiasm will be limited, for G. K. either has ardent supporters who feel that his idiom is an ingeniously ideal means of expressing perennial values, or disdainful critics like the late Dean Inge whose exasperation at paradox was expressed in his complaint that Chesterton was "an obese mountebank who crucifies truth feet upward."

Tales of the Long Bow, originally published in 1924, is one of the volumes in Sheed and Ward's *New World Chesterton* series, which includes G. K.'s *Robert Louis Stevenson, The Flying Inn, The Poet and the Lunatics, Tremendous Trifles,* and *Chaucer.*

As one who has prowled through old bookshops looking for lesser-known works of Chesterton, this reviewer greets this moderately-priced series with considerable enthusiasm.

The *Tales* are tall tales of amicable eccentrics, doing things "impossible to do, impossible to believe." They are tales in that they are quite preposterous; they are tall in that the lessons they teach tower above the decade in which they were written.

The unimaginative may think that Colonel Crane who wore a cabbage for a hat might well have had a cabbage for a head. But the good colonel who, in an unwonted moment of enthusiasm, had wagered to eat his hat, rather logically preferred a hat that was to be tasted rather than felt.

Like most of his amiable companions: Owen Hood, Captain Pierce, Parson White, Professor Green, and Commander Blair, Colonel Crane does things as rigorously improbable as they are rigorously logical. One hastens to add, however, that the non-conformism of this lunatic league is based on an affirmation of personality over custom, rather than on an espousal of subversion, or a repudiation of convention for repudiation's sake.

In a passage that is as timely in the fifties as it was in the twenties, the colonel's inamorata, Miss Smith, refers to meticulously casual crowd of the cult of the unconventional: "They do those things because they are done; because they are done in their own Bohemian set. Unconventionality is their convention."

These chronicles of the League of the Long Bow are indeed quite fanciful, but as Chesterton has brought out in his *chef d'oeuvre, Orthodoxy,* the fanciful is often an illumination of truth rather than its repudiation. G. K. says in his closing essay: "Images are in their nature indefensible, if they miss the imagination of another, and the foolish scribe of the Long Bow will not commit the last folly of defending his dreams." For the literal-minded, no defense will be possible; for those who have discerned Chesterton's imagery, no defense will be necessary.

ROBERT PAUL MOHAN, S.S.

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND THE ORIGINALITY OF CHRIST. By Geoffrey Graystone, S.M. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956. Pp. 117. $2.50.

This cautious investigation of M. Dupont-Sommer's fanciful thesis that Christianity is an outgrowth of the Essenism of Qumran should have been published as a pamphlet immediately after the original articles appeared in the *Irish Theological Quarterly.* We needed some-

thing like this to reassure those who had been disturbed by Edmund Wilson's brilliant reporting and by the less than brilliant propagandizing of several Unitarian ministers, who found in Dupont-Sommer's imaginings justification for some of their untheological positions. The provisional character of a book like this, moreover, hardly justifies the expense of publication in book form. It will be a long time before little besides a critical edition of the Qumran texts themselves can be looked upon as definitive. To give just one obvious example of correction dictated by subsequent investigation: when the pertinent manuscript was ultimately unrolled in part, it was found to be an Aramaic Midrash on Genesis, not the lost Apocalypse of Lamech, as was thought and as reported on p. 6 of this book.

This work is at its best when it adheres to the principle that the only effective apologetic is dispassionate examination of the evidence. The now familiar story of the discovery of the Qumran library, the history of the community as known from the documents and from archeology, the organization, practices, and doctrines of these Essenes are described interestingly and factually. The confrontation of Dupont-Sommer's thesis with the evidence easily delimits fact and conjecture. But Father Graystone unfortunately has not succeeded in raising himself completely above an atmosphere of panic in which problems of this kind are too often discussed. When he quotes disapprovingly Professor Albright's statement that the new information derived from Qumran "bids fair to revolutionize our approach to the beginnings of Christianity" (p. 4) he leaves the uninformed reader with the impression that America's outstanding Semitics' scholar is in the Dupont-Sommer camp, because the quotation comes immediately after one from the Sorbonne professor. This association is a serious injustice to Professor Albright, who has said emphatically on many a lecture platform, "I don't believe for a moment in the modern legend of a pre-Christian Jesus."

Father Graystone's repeated and often unqualified denials of the dependence of Christianity upon specific practices or doctrines of the Qumran Essenes give the reader little opportunity to suspect the revolutionary contribution which the writings are making toward New Testament history and theology. They fill a huge gap in our knowledge of the organic relations between Old and New Testaments. They lend

strong support to the view that pre-Christian revelation was not restricted to the canonical books of the Old Testament; that it developed even quantitatively in the *ecclesia Dei* of the Old Testament and is reflected in the rules, prayers, and speculations of the Qumran Essenes more strikingly than in any other non-biblical writings of the period

EDWARD F. SIEGMAN, C.PP.S.

I AM A DAUGHTER OF THE CHURCH. By P. Marie-Eugene, O.C.D. Chicago: Fides Publishers, 1955. $6.75.

This is the second volume of a practical synthesis of Carmelite spirituality. Volume one appeared in 1953, under the title *I Want To See God.* Both of these books are exactly what they purport to be—an eminently practical synthesis of Carmelite spirituality. It has always been within the tradition of Carmelite authors to treat of the spiritual life from the standpoint of a spiritual director. The writings of St. Teresa, of St. John of the Cross, and of St. Therese are very definitely works of spiritual direction. Father Marie-Eugene has produced a most needed synthesis of the progressive development of the different stages of the spiritual life, as explained in the writings of these great Carmelite Saints. "The Interior Castle," St. Teresa's most mature work, is the background against which this synthesis is developed. Using the division of the spiritual life into seven mansions as his basis, he takes the works of St. John of the Cross and of St. Teresa and shows the conformity between the writings of these great authors within the schema of these same seven mansions.

The beginning of the spiritual life, replete as it is with sensible fervor and yearnings for God, and the summit, characterized by a very evident strength of will in adherence to God and the heroic practice of virtue, are ordinarily quite easily discernible to the spiritual director. However, between the beginning and end there are those periods (enigmatic for many spiritual directors), described by St. John of the Cross respectively as the night of the sense and of the spirit and by St. Teresa as the fourth, fifth, and sixth mansions. It is at the time of the soul's initiation into these periods by God's activity that the ordinary spiritual director

becomes lost, misunderstands, and unfortunately misdirects the souls entrusted to him.

In the first three hundred pages of this book, Father Marie-Eugene explains quite clearly a number of the different possible experiences which souls could encounter in the fourth mansions and during the night of sense. He first describes the prayers of supernatural recollection, of quiet, and of contemplative dryness or of faith. There follows an excellent explanation of the seeming differences in these prayers and the cause of these differences in the soul's varied experience of God as light or as love.

He then enters into a comprehensive description of the realm of the night of sense. Frequently, many have only a very hazy notion of this spiritual experience, consider it extraordinary, and are quite lost as to how to advise a soul encountering it. Rightly, Father Marie-Eugene gives tremendous importance to the direction of the soul at this time and much space to explaining the activity in which the soul must engage at the time of its prayer and outside the time of prayer. This activity is of primary importance since without it God's activity would be rendered fruitless. This period of the spiritual life is by no means one of complete passivity, as some seem to think, but demands an intense ascetic program by the soul outside of prayer and a very definite active attitude during prayer itself.

There follows a very interesting, enlightening and instructive section on the extraordinary favors sometimes evident in holy souls after entering the fourth mansion.

The treatment given the drama of the night of the spirit is as clear and comprehensive as that given the night of sense. The explanation of this stage of the spiritual life comes at a very propitious time. Within the last few years there have appeared a number of books written by supposedly learned priests on the life of St. Therese of Lisieux. In these books the authors have striven mightily to explain the phenomena of her recorded autobiography according to the norms of natural psychology and psychiatry. It is inexcusable for any priest and especially one possessing doctoral degrees to judge the supernatural according to purely natural norms. St. John of the Cross has masterfully laid down very definite principles according to which psychological

phenomena evident in the lives of all men are to be ascribed to natural or supernatural causes. Father Marie-Eugene, in a section entitled "psychical phenomena and disturbance," brings out the resemblance and yet marked difference between such natural phenomena and that caused by the dark night. Because of its timeliness with the present downward trend of some spiritual writings to the natural level, this becomes one of the important parts of the book and would of itself justify the work.

At the conclusion of the book there is a final section entitled "The Saint in the Whole Christ," wherein is excellently explained the final realization of the perfection of the life to which God has called each individual soul.

Although the book is not exciting and is really quite heavy at times, which is natural for a work of such nature, it is decidedly one of the most important of our age. It was written for the purpose of spiritual direction, and in this field it has no equal other than the original works themselves of St. Theresa and St. John of the Cross. No priest should be without both volumes. A solid perusal of these books will establish them for the spiritual director as a source of constant and handy information in this field. It is too bad that these books were published without a comprehensive index; however, this is somewhat compensated by a very detailed outline of contents.

FATHER GABRIEL, O.C.D.

OUR CHILDREN AND THE MASS. By Alain Sauveboeuf. Chicago: Fides Publishers, 1956. Pp. 82. $1.00.

The flyleaf of this new booklet states that this book, a translation of *Nos enfants et la Messe,* is of particular importance to the clergy, parents, teachers, and all who have to do with children. It suggests a method of making the Mass a living experience for the children, as opposed to methods which are more nearly exercises in reading, serving only to occupy them during Mass. In his preface, Sauveboeuf declares, "It seems that a large number of children nowadays are no longer as pious as they used to be. . . ." We believe it would be valuable to study this problem of our children and the Mass in order to try to discover how it might be solved.

The author then attempts to give answers to this vital problem. While a solution to this perplexing problem is nearly impossible because of the scope of difficulties, the author attempts to provide practical (and sometimes impractical) suggestions as to an acceptable approach appropriate to the age and to the psychological and intellectual characteristics of elementary school pupils between the ages of five and fourteen.

Using as a basis for his work a study made in various French parochial schools, Sauveboeuf discovers two major causes for a child's lack of adaptation to the Mass. These are sociological and educational. Since the sociological cause stems mainly from home environment in which the parents themselves are poorly trained in appreciation for the Mass, Sauveboeuf turns immediately to the school, and the educational causes where he finds that the teachers themselves do not possess sufficient knowledge of the Mass, and that teaching methods are not adapted to the young pupil's physiological and psychological limitations.

When recommending remedies, Father Sauveboeuf offers the most telling points of his book among which are: the teacher, himself well trained, must impress the pupil with a sense of God and of the sacred, by his own attitude of respect for everything sacred, no matter how slight or seemingly insignificant—from signing himself devoutly to picking bits of paper from the church floor. No spiritual exercise must ever give way to a secular pursuit. And always allowing for the capacity and needs of the pupil, the teacher must instil within him a veneration of the true and the beautiful, the basis of prayer and worship.

Many obvious teaching principles are set down for teachers, e.g. the child should be able to see the altar. Among these principles are two that, once explored, could possibly bear rich fruit. First, the next day's Mass could be prepared briefly at the end of the school day with an explanation of words and the meaning of the Mass. Secondly, a suggestion that presents untold possibilities for further exploration, is that a priest, as part of a classroom intruction, could enact a Mass to illustrate in detail the actions of the Holy Sacrifice.

Obviously this short review could not possibly study the author's numerous excellent suggestions for every age group between five and fourteen. Suffice to say that he has many fine practical suggestions and principles. On the other hand he is limited by the fact that in this country spoken choruses, sung Masses, movements in unison with the Priest, have not as yet been widely accepted as the people's share in the Mass.

The second section of the booklet attempts to adapt the above to the various age groups according to their ability. On pp. 66 to 70, Sauveboeuf presents an example of what one class did to put into effect his principles. The example is excellent.

Our Children and the Mass leaves many questions to be answered. It leaves one with an increased conviction that proper study materials must be provided. It does not quite satisfactorily make the Mass live. But it does present a large number of ideas, possibly new to some, that do definitely open a new horizon to the study and teaching of the Mass.

ADAM J. KOSTICK

SAINT JOSEPH. By Henri Rondet, S.J. Translated by Donald Attwater. New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1956. Pp. ix + 243. $4.00.

The place occupied by St. Joseph in the canonical Gospels is only a small one; but it would be a mistake to infer that this relative silence is the measure of his part in God's designs and the economy of salvation. There are, in the Gospels, events and sayings which were for a long time almost unheeded, until Christian piety, theological reflection and decisions of the Church's teaching authority uncovered the depths of their significance.

St. Joseph, it would seem, is only lately coming into his own. There is an ever-growing interest in and devotion to him, which befits him as the Foster Father of the Son of God, the Protector of the Universal Church, and now as the Patron of Workingmen. Accordingly, there has been a growing literature about the Saint, to which Father Bondet's book is a welcome addition, especially in translation for English-speaking peoples.

The first part of the book, some short fifty pages, which originally appeared as an article in *Nouvelle revue théologique,* is a sketch of the development of devotion to the Saint; the representation of the Saint in art; and a very concise exposition of the theology of St. Joseph.

The second part of the book is, the reviewer feels, of especial value to priests as a source of fresh sermon and meditation material. It comprises an anthology of significant writings on the Saint by such authorities as St. John Chrysostom, St. Teresa of Avila, St. Bernard, St. Francis de Sales, St. Alphonsus, as well as passages from Bossuet, Gerson, Alban Butler, Faber, Newman, Leo XIII, and Pius XII.

The book is illustrated with some of the finest examples of St. Joseph in art; in this regard, however, the reviewer finds it somewhat exasperating that a particular painting of the Saint mentioned by the author in glowing terms is not to be found among the plates in the book.

WILLIAM DENNIS RYAN

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. By Albert Weiss, O.P. Translated by Sister M. Fulgence, O.P. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1956. Pp. 166. $2.95.

Father Albert Weiss taught at Vienna, Grasz, and Fribourg. He was a member of the commission which worked on the Leonine edition of the *Summa Theologica* in Rome. The Cross and Crown Series of Spirituality offers the present work as an addition to their library of spiritual books. It is a translation of Part IV, Volume III of *Apologie des Christentums.* The translation is excellent.

The book is composed of eight essays on the Christian's call to conform himself to the divine Exemplar, Jesus Christ. Each chapter presents the prayerful consideration of basic Catholic truths relative to our call to live a life of faith. The author takes pains to show that a unified life, unified activity and unified thinking are the constituents of the true Christian's life. The union of the natural with the supernatural is the unique life-work of every Christian. The notion that grace does not destroy nature but perfects it is stressed. The unifying theme for the various chapters is the idea that as men we strive for the perfection of our human nature.